National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. Without Concealment....Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. XI....NO. 5. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1850. WHOLE NO. 525.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Selections.

RESOLUTIONS AND ADDRESS: OF THE NASHVILLE CONVENTION.

Nashville, June 8, 1850.

Mr. Gordon, of Virginia, from the committee on resolutions and propositions, reported the following resolutions and Address, which were read, laid on the table till Monday next, and ordered to be printed for the use of the members of the Convention:

1. *Resolved*, That the territories of the United States belong to the people of the several States of this Union as their common property. That the citizens of the several States have equal rights to migrate with their property to these territories, and are equally entitled to the protection of the Federal Government in the enjoyment of that property so long as the territories remain under the charge of that government.

2. *Resolved*, That Congress has no power to exclude from the territory of the United States any property lawfully held in the States of the Union, and any act which may be passed by Congress to effect this result is a plain violation of the Constitution of the United States.

3. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of Congress to provide proper governments for the territories, since the spirit of American institutions forbids the maintenance of military governments in time of peace; and, as all laws heretofore existing in territories once belonging to foreign powers which interfere with the full enjoyment of religion, the freedom of the press, the trial by jury, and all other rights by persons and property as secured or recognized in the Constitution of the United States are necessarily void so soon as such territories become American territories, it is the duty of the Federal Government to make early provision for the enactment of those laws which may be expedient and necessary to secure to the inhabitants of and emigrants to such territories the full benefit of the constitutional rights we assert.

4. *Resolved*, That to protect property existing in the several States of the Union the people of these States invested the Federal Government with the powers of war and negotiation and of sustaining armies and navies and prohibited to State authorities the exercise of the same powers. They made no discrimination in the protection to be afforded or the description of the property to be defended, nor was it allowed to the Federal Government to determine what should be held as property. Whatever the States deal with as property the Federal Government is bound to recognize and defend as such. Therefore it is the sense of this convention that all acts of the Federal Government which tend to denationalize property of any description recognized in the Constitution and laws of the States, or that discriminate the degree and efficiency of the protection to be afforded to it, or which weaken or destroy the title of any citizen upon American territories, are plain and palpable violations of the fundamental law under which it exists.

5. *Resolved*, That the slaveholding States cannot and will not submit to the enactment by Congress of any law imposing onerous conditions or restraints upon the rights of masters to remove with their property into the territories of the United States, or to any law making discriminations in favor of the proprietors of other property against them.

6. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of the Federal Government plainly to recognize and firmly to maintain the equal rights of the citizens of the several States in the territories of the United States, and to repudiate the power to make a discrimination between the proprietors of different species of property in federal legislation. The fulfilment of this duty by the Federal Government would greatly tend to restore the peace of the country and to allay the exasperation and excitement which now exists between the different sections of the Union. For it is the deliberate opinion of this convention that the tolerance Congress has given to the notion that federal authority might be employed incidentally and indirectly to subvert or weaken the institutions existing in the States confessedly beyond federal jurisdiction and control, is a main cause of the discord which menace the existence of the Union, and has well nigh destroyed the efficient action of the Federal Government itself

7. *Resolved*, That the performance of this duty is required by the fundamental law of the Union. The equality of the people of the several States composing the Union cannot be disturbed without disturbing the frame of the American institutions. This principle is violated in the denial of the citizens of the slaveholding States of power to enter into the territories with the property lawfully acquired in the States. The warfare against this right is a war upon the Constitution. The defenders of this right are defenders of the Constitution. Those who deny or impair its exercise are unfaithful to the Constitution, and, if disunion follows the destruction of the right, they are the disunionists.

8. *Resolved*, That the performance of its duties upon the principle we declare, would enable Congress to remove the embarrassments in which the country is now involved. The vacant territories of the United States, no longer regarded as prizes for sectional rapacity and ambition, would be gradually occupied by inhabitants drawn to them by their interests and feelings. The institutions fitted to them would be naturally applied by governments formed on American ideas and approved by the deliberate choice of their constituents. The community would be educated and disciplined under a republican administration in habits of self-government, and fitted for an association as a State, and to the enjoyment of a place in the confederacy. A community so formed and organized might well claim admission to the Union, and none would dispute the validity of the claim.

9. *Resolved*, That a recognition of this principle would deprive the question between Texas and the United States of their sectional character, and would leave them for adjustment, without disturbance from sectional prejudices and passions upon considerations of magnanimity and justice.

10. *Resolved*, That a recognition of this principle would infuse a spirit of conciliation in the discussion and adjustment of all the subjects of sectional dispute, which would afford a guarantee of an early and satisfactory determination.

11. *Resolved*, That in he event a dominant majority shall refuse to recognize the great constitutional rights we assert, and shall continue to deny the obligations of the Federal Government to maintain them, it is the sense of this Convention that the Territories should be treated as property and divided between the sections of the Union, so that the rights of both sections be adequately secured in their respective shares. That we are aware that this course is open to grave objections, but we are ready to acquiesce in the adoption of the line of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, extending to the Pacific ocean, as an extreme concession, upon considerations of what is due to the stability of our institutions.

12. *Resolved*, That it is the opinion of this Convention this controversy should be ended, either by a recognition of the constitutional rights of the Southern people or by an equitable partition of the territories—that the spectacle of a confederacy of States involved in quarrels over the fruits of a war in which the American arms were crowned with glory is humiliating, that the incorporation of the Wilmot proviso in the offer of settlement, a proposition which fourteen States regard as disparaging and dishonorable, is degrading to the country. A termination to this controversy by the disruption of the Confederacy or by the abandonment of the territories to prevent such a result would be a climax to the shame which attaches to the controversy which it is the paramount duty of Congress to avoid.

13. *Resolved*, That this Convention will not conclude that Congress will adjourn without making an adjustment of this controversy, and, in the condition in which the Convention finds the questions before Congress, it does not feel at liberty to discuss the methods suitable for a resistance of measures not yet adopted, which might involve a dishonor to the Southern States.

To the People of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, Louisiana, Texas, Missouri, and Arkansas:

Fellow-Citizens: In obedience to the commands of those we represent, we have assembled together to confer with each other concerning your relation with the General Government, and the nonslaveholding States of the Union, on the subject of the institution of Slavery. We deem it proper to lay before you as briefly as the subject will permit, the result of our deliberations and councils.

In order that your condition may be understood, and the conclusions at which we have arrived be justly appreciated, it is necessary briefly to refer to a few past transactions.

It is now sixteen years since the Institution of Slavery in the South began to be agitated in Congress, and assailed by our sister States. Up to that time, the people of the Northern States seem to have respected the rights reserved to the Southern States by the Constitution, and to have acted under the conviction that the subject of Slavery being beyond the legislation of Congress, all agitation with respect to it on the part of Congress was equally forbidden by the Constitution. But, at the time, a portion of the people of the North began to assail in Congress the Institution of Slavery, and to accomplish their object of dragging it into the vortex of Congressional agitation, they claimed the right of petitioning Congress on all subjects whatsoever. As a petition is only the first step in legislation, it was clear that a right to petition a legislative body must be limited by its powers of legislation. No one can have a right to ask of another to do that which he has no moral or legal right to do. Nor can any tribunal have the power to receive and consider any matter beyond its jurisdiction. The claim therefore to present petitions to Congress on the subject of Slavery was considered by the Southern representatives generally as an attempt indirectly to assume jurisdiction over the subject itself in all parts of the Union. The object, without disguise, was the overthrow of Slavery in the States, but our assailants framed the petitions presented chiefly against Slavery in the District of Columbia and our territories, and against what they call the internal slave trade—that is, the transmission of slaves from one Southern State to another. Conscious of the fatal tendency of the agitation of Slavery in Congress to destroy the peace and stability of the Union, an effort was made, supported by a large portion of the Northern representatives, to suppress it by a rule in the House of Representatives, which provided that all petitions on the subject of Slavery should be neither considered, printed, nor referred. This rule was assailed by the people of the Northern States as violating that clause of the Constitution which prohibits Congress from passing laws to prevent the people from peaceably assembling and petitioning for a redress of grievances. In December, 1844, this rule fell before the almost unanimous voice of the North, and [illegible] unlimited power of introducing and considering the subject of Slavery in Congress was asserted. In the mean time, the course of the Northern people showed clearly that the agitation of Slavery in Congress was only one of the means they relied on to overthrow this Institution throughout the Union. Newspapers were set up amongst them, and lecturers were hired to go abroad to excite them against Slavery in the Southern States, Organizations were formed to carry off slaves from the South, and to protect them by violence from recapture. Although the Constitution requires the fugitive slaves, like fugitives from justice, to be rendered up by the States to which they may have fled, the Legislatures of almost every Northern State, faithless to this treaty stipulation between the States, passed laws designed and entirely calculated to defeat this provision of the Constitution, without which the Union would have never existed, and by these laws virtually nullified the act of 1794, passed by Congress to aid its enforcement. Not content with the agitation of Slavery in political circles, the Northern people forced it also into the religious associations extending over the Union, and produced a separation of the Methodist and Baptist churches. The result of all these various methods of assailing Slavery in the Southern States, was, that it became the grand topic of interest and discussion in Congress and out of Congress, and one of the most important elements of politics in the Union. Thus an institution, belonging to the Southern States exclusively, was wrested from their exclusive control; and, instead of that protection which is the great object of all governments, and which the Constitution of the United States guarantees to all the States and their institutions, the Northern States and Congress under their control, combined together to assail and destroy Slavery in the South. The Southern States did nothing to vindicate their rights and arrest this course of things. The Mexican war broke out, and, instead of that patriotic cooperation of all sections of the Union, which would have taken place in the better days of the Republic, to bring it to a just and honorable conclusion, in the very first appropriation bill to carry it on, the North endeavored to thrust the subject of Slavery.—Throughout the war, they kept up the agitation; thus clearly manifesting their determination that the General Government, in none of its operations, internal or external, shall be exempted from the introduction of this dangerous subject. The war closed with honor; and an immense territory was added to the United States. Their previous threats were realized; and the non-slaveholding States immediately claimed the right to exclude the people of the Southern States from all the territory acquired, and to appropriate it to themselves. If this pretension arose from a mere lust of power, it would be hard to bear the superiority and mastery it implies. It would degrade the Southern States from being the equals of the Northern States to the position of colonial inferiority. But when your exclusion is not far from a mere lust of power, but is only a further step in the progress of things, aiming at the abolition of Slavery in the States, by the extension and multiplication of non-slaveholding States in the Union, the pretension is seen to be as alarming as it is insulting. The Southern States, in their Legislature, set forth with great unanimity the rights in our territories belonging to them, in communion with the Northern States, and declared their determination to maintain them; and, finding in the Northern States no disposition to abate their demands, the Convention in which we are assembled has been brought together to take counsel as to the course the Southern States should pursue for the maintenance of their rights, liberty, and honor

Such is a brief but imperfect statement of past transactions; and they force upon us the question, in what condition do they place the Southern States? And first what is their condition in Congress? The time was when your Representatives in Congress weir neither offered nor would the endure reproach in your behalf. But, for many years past, they have heard you in Congress habitually reviled by the most opprobrious epithets on account of the institution of Slavery. If their spirits are yet unbroken, they must be chilled by a sense of humiliation at the insults they daily receive as your representatives.—You are arraigned as criminals. Slavery is dragged into every debate, and Congress has become little else than a grand instrument in the hands of Abolitionists to degrade and ruin the South. Instead of peace and protection, aggression and insult on the South characterize its proceedings and councils.—And what is your condition with respect to your sister States? Where is that respect and comity which (due from all nations towards each other) is more especially due from States bound together in a confederacy, and which was once displayed in all their intercourse. Instead of respect and sympathy, denunciation and hostility on account of your institution of Slavery have for years past characterized the communication addressed to you by the Northern States. And what is your condition in the Union? The non-slaveholding States stand combined not only to wrest from you your common property but to place upon your front the brand of inferiority. You are not to extend on account of your institutions, but they are to increase and multiply, that the shame and sin of Slavery may, by their philanthopic agency, be extinguised from amongst you. But the worst feature of your condition is, that it is *progressive*. As low and humiliating as it may be now, it is destined if not arrested, to "a lower deep." Every effect is a cause; and the spirit of fanaticism brooks no delay in the progress it creates. If yon were to yield everything the North now requires—abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia—submit to be legislated pirates for conveying slaves from one State to another—let trial by jury and writ of habeas corpus wrest from you in the Northern States every fugitive slave—give up all your territories to swell Northern arrogance and predominance—would things stop there? These are all means aiming at one great end—the abolition of Slavery in the States. Surrendering one of these means, you will but inflame the power by which another will be exacted—and when all are conquered will the evil be arrested? In fifty years twenty new non-slaveholding States may be added to the Union, whilst many which are now slaveholding may become non-slaveholding States. There then will be no need as now openly to put aside the constitution to reach their object. It they will deign to do it, the non-slaveholding States will then have the power by two-thirds in Congress and three-fourths of the States to amend the constitution, and then have its express sanction to consummate their policy. Your condition is progressive.

If, from the past transactions we have narrated we learn our condition in the Union, they teach us also that our past policy of non-action and submission to aggression cannot bring us peace and safety When the doors of Congress were thrown open to agitation on the subject of Slavery, if the Southern States had moved with energy to avert a state of things unconstitutional itself, and surely tending to bring the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States into collision, although late, it might not have been too late to stop subsequent encroachments upon our rights. But the Southern States were passive; and their forbearanae has had the effect of inspiring the Northern people with the belief, either that we value a union with them more than we value the institution of Slavery or that we dare not move from a conscious inability to protect ourselves. You have ungenerously stood still, whilst your supporters and the defenders of the constitution in the Northern States, in their efforts to protect you from the agitations of Slavery in Congress, have been politically annihilated or have turned your foes. You have tamely acquiesced, until to hate and persecute the South has become a high passport to honor and power in the Union. You have unwisely stood still; whilst year after year the volume of Anti-Slavery policy and sympathy has swollen into unanimity throughout all the non-slaveholding States, and the sections of the Union now face each other in stern collision. You have waited until the constitution of the United States has been virtually abolished—or what is worse, it is only what the majority in Congress think fit to make it. That great principle on which our system of free government rests—of so dividing the powers of government that, to a common government, only those powers should be granted which [illegible] equality in its operations, whilst all powers over all interests, local or sectional, should be reserved to local or sectional governments—is uprooted from the constitution. Local and sectional interests absorb the time and business of Congress, and thus a sectional despotism—totally irresponsible to the people of the South—constituted of the representatives in Congress from the non-slaveholding States—ignorant of our feelings, condition, and institutions—reigns at Washington. These are the fruits of your past forbearance and submission.

If we look into the nature of things, such results will not seem to be either new or strange. There is but one condition in which one people can be safe under the dominion of another people, and that is when their interests are entirely identical. Then the dominant cannot oppress the subject people without oppressing themselves. The identity of interests between them is the security of right of government. But, as this identity can scarcely ever exist between any two people, history bears but one testimony as to the fate of a subject people. They have always been compelled to minister to the prosperity and aggrandizement of their masters. If this has always been the case under the ordinary differences of interests and feelings which exist between States, how much more certainly must the experience of history be realized between the people of the Northern and Southern States. Here is a difference of climate and productions throughout a territory stretching along the whole belt of the temperate zone, affecting the pursuits and characters of the people inhabiting it. But the great difference—the *one* great difference—the greatest which can exist among a people—is the institution of Slavery. This alone sets apart the Southern States as a peculiar people, with whom independence as to their internal policy is the condition of their existence. They must rule themselves or perish. Every colony in the world, where African Slavery existed, with one exception, has been destroyed; and if this has been the case under the old and effete governments of Europe, will it not prevail under the dominion of the restless people of the Northern States? They do not practically recognize the inferiority of the African to the Caucasian race. They do not realize, because the circumstances of their condition do not compel them to realize, the impossibility of an amalgamation between the races. Exempt from the institution of Slavery, it is not surprising that their sympathies should be against us while the dogma on which they profess to build their system of free government—*the absolute rule of the majority*—leaves no barrier to their power in the affairs of the General Government, and leads them to its consolidation. Religion, too, false or real, fires their enthusiasm against an institution, which many of its professors believe it to be consistent with its principles and precepts. To expect forbearance from such a people, under such circumstances, toward the institution of Slavery, is manifestly vain. If they have been false to the compact made with us in the Constitution, and have allowed passion and prejudice to master reason, they have only exemplified that frailty and fallibility of our nature, which has produced the necessity of all governments, and which, if unchecked, ever produces wrong. The institutions of Slavery having once entered the popular mind of the non-slaveholding States, for action and control, the rest is inevitable. If unrestrained by us, they will go on until African Slavery will be swept from the broad and fertile South. The nature of things, therefore, independent of experience, teaches us that there can be no safety in submission.

To submit to evils, however great, whilst they are endurable, is the disposition of every people—especially of an agricultural people, living apart and having no association in their pursuits. But the responsibility of preserving a free government rests with all its members, whatever may be their pursuits, and not alone with those who have the power or the will to destroy it. A minority, by submission, may as much betray the Constitution as a majority by aggression. The Constitution does not protect a majority—for they have all the powers of the government in their hands and can protect themselves. The limitations of a constitution are designed to protect the minority—those who have no power, against those who have it. Hence the great motive and duty of self-protection is peculiar to a minority, independent of the faith to the Constitution, which they owe in common with the majority. They must protect themselves and protect the Constitution, and if they fail in this double duty, they are at least as culpable as those who, in aggressing upon their rights, overthrow the Constitution. And the public opinion of the world is in conformity with these views. The oppressor is hated, but the unresistingly oppressed is dispised. More respect follows the tyrant than the slave who submits to his power. The Southern States, therefore, although a minority, are not exempt from the responsibility of preserving the Constitution, and in preserving it to protect themselves.

In what way shall they preserve the Constitution and protect themselves?

As a general rule, it is undoubtedly true that when in a government like ours, a constitution is violated by a majority—who alone can violate it in matters of legislation—it cannot be restored to its integrity through the ordinary means of the government; for these means being under the control of the majority are not available to the minority. It is for this reason that frequent election of our rulers take place in our system of free government, in order that the people, by their direct intervention, may change the majority. But this resource cannot avail us in the violations of the Constitution, which now press and harass the South. By changing their representatives, how can the people of the South affect the majority in Congress and restore the Constitution?—Their representatives are true, and have done all that men can do to preserve the Coustitution from the aggressions of the majority. Removing them and putting other representatives in Congress could have no effect in restoring the Constitution. It has been broken by the representatives of the people of the Northern States who sustain them in their violations of the Constitution. It is clear that the ballot-box in the South is powerless for its protection. And the same causes which induced the violations of the Constitution by the Northern majority prevent its restoration to its integrity.

Throughout the Northeren States, there has been no indication of any change in their policy. On the contrary, the majority against the South is greater in the present Congress than in the last, following the usual course of every successive election for years past. Nor have we seen in the action of the States any proof of a returning sense of justice to us, or of reverence for the Constitution. Several of them, lest false inferences might be drawn as to their position, have taken care lately to reiterate in the most offensive forms their former declarations against our rights; and when a great Senator, representing one of them, anxious for the perpetuation of the Union, has ventured to advocate something of justice to the South, he has been rebuked by the Legislature of the State he represents, and virtually denounced for his fidelity to the Constitution. This resource, then under the ordinary operations of the Constitution, is of no avail. And how is it with the present Congress, the only other source of redress in the usual administration of the Constitution?—For six months it has been in session, and during this whole period of time Slavery has been the absorbing topic of discussion and agitation. Yet nothing has been done to heal the discontents which so justly exist in the South, or restore a bleeding Constitution. All we have received has been bitter denunciations of our institutions by many members of Congress, and threats to coerce us into submission. Although nothing has been done, a report has been made in the Senate by a Committee of thirteen members, which is now pending in that body; and, as the measures it proposes have been pressed upon the South as worthy of her acceptance, we deem it proper to lay before you a brief consideration of the matters it contains.

This report embraces four distinct measures: 1st, the admission of California as a State, with the exclusion of slavery in her constitution; 2d, territorial governments to be erected over the territories of Utah and New Mexico, with nearly one half of Texas to be added to the latter; 3d, the prohibition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia; and 4th, provisions for the recapture of fugitive slaves in the non-slaveholding States. To understand whether these measures are consistent with our rights and worthy of our acceptance, each of them must be considered separately.

The South is excluded by the bill from the whole of that part of California lying on the Pacific, including one hundred and fifty thousand square miles of territory; and if this be done by the legislation of Congress, the mode in which it is done is of no importance. California belongs to the United Srates, and all action by the individuals in that territory, whether from the United States or the rest of the world, appropriating the soil to themselves or erecting a government over it, is of no validity. They constitute a people in no proper sense of the term; but are citizens of the States or countries from which they have come, and to which they still owe their allegiance. When, therefore, Congress attempts to carry out and confirm the acts of these individuals, erecting California into a State and excluding Slavery therefrom, it is the same thing as if Congress had originally passed a law to this effect, without the intervention of these individuals. The exclusion of Slavery from California is done by the act of Congress, and by no other authority. The Constitution of California becomes the act of Congress; and the Wilmot proviso it contains is the Wilmot proviso passed and enforced by the legislation of Congress. Here, then, is that exclusion from the territory by the act of Congress, which almost every Southern State in the Union has declared she would not submit to, plainly and practically enforced by this bill. A free people cannot be satisfied with the mode in which they are deprived of their rights. A sovereign State will disdain to inquire in what manner she is stripped of her property, and degraded from an equality with her sister States. It is enough that the outrage is done. The mode is of little consequence. There is, therefore, in the mode of extending the Wilmot Proviso over the territory of California presented by the bill nothing to mitigate the indignation of the Southern States, or to baffle their determination to redress the wrong if inflicted.—They are excluded from the whole territory of California, a territory extensive enough to contain four large States.

If the constitution proposed by California contained nothing about Slavery, would the North allow her to enter the Union? Such were the territorial bills proposed for California at the last Congress, but they rejected them, because the South was not excluded from the territory, in express terms. The habitants of this territory have been left without any civil government, solely because the South would not consent to be legislated out of them with her institutions; and now that this object is accomplished by the constitution presented by California, these conservatives—these advocates of law and order—are eager to administer, without right or precedent, into the Union. We are aware of the inconveniences the inhabitants of California may have suffered for want of a civil government established by Congress, and, therefore, are prepared to yield much on account of the circumstances in which they have been placed. In the resolutions we have adopted and submit for your approbation you will perceive that we recommend you to assent to the admission of California as a State on certain conditions.

The next measure is in perfect keeping with this first features of "the report." It takes from Texas territory sufficient for two large States, and adds them to New Mexico. What the bill contains with respect to Slavery will be of little consequence, for it is designed that next winter, New Mexico thus constituted shall follow the example of California, and be admitted as a State with a constitution excluding Slavery from its limits—for without such exclusion she cannot hope to be admitted by the non-slaveholding States into the Union. The effect will be that territory over which Slavery now exists, equal to two States, will be wrested from the South, and will be given up to the non-slaveholding States. The pretext is, that there is some doubt as to the boundaries of Texas. Texas by her laws, when she was admitted into the Union, had but one boundary toward the West, and that boundary was the Rio Grande. Congress in the resolutions admitting her into the Union recognized this boundary, by laying down a line of limitation between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States—(being the Missouri compromise line of 36 deg. 30 min. parallel of North latitude)—through that very part of her territory, her right to which is now questioned. Her boundary of the Rio Grande to its source alone gave her this country; and was thus recognized and ratified by the resolutions of annexation. To vindicate this boundary for Texas, as a member of the Union, the Mexican war took place, and in the treaty of Guadaloupe Hidalgo, it was finally vindicated and settled, by a clause in the treaty, designating the Rio Grande as the boundary between Mexico and the United States. Thus, by the laws of Texas, by the legislation of Congress, and by a solemn treaty of the United States, the Rio Grande is the western boundary of Texas. Yet the pretension is set up that her territory does not extend to within three hundred miles of the Missouri compromise line, where Congress in receiving her into the Union determined that her territory should be divided between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. Texas is the only State in the Union which has the solemn guarantee of the government of the United States in every possible form to her boundaries. Yet this is the government which disputes them; and, under the pretext that they are very doubtful, proposes to take from her nearly one half of her territory. It is by virtue of such pretensions that by the bill two States are to be taken from the Southern and given to the Northern States; and this wrong is aggravated by compelling us to pay for it, through the Treasury of the United States.

It is undoubtedly proper that Texas should be quieted as to her boundaries; but she should be quieted by a law of Congress, plainly acknowledging them. If, after her boundaries are settled, the General Government, to carry out the purposes of the Constitution, or in good faith to fulfil all the obligations the annexation of Texas to the Union requires, should think proper to purchase any territory from Texas, the arrangement may be unobjectionable. But any arrangement concerning her territories, which leaves a shade of doubt as to the right of the people of the South to enter any portion of territory, which, according to the terms of annexation, are now free to them, neither Texas nor the General Government have any right to make. The terms of annexation constitute the compact of Union between Texas and the other States of the confederacy—and this compact secures irrevocably to the people of the slaveholding States the right of entering with their property all her territory lying south of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude—whilst from all her territory lying north of that line they are excluded. The bill in the Senate makes no provision for carrying out these terms of the compact, but leaves in doubt the right of the Southern people throughout all the territory proposed to be purchased, whilst many who support the bill declare that, in effect, it excludes entirely the people of the Southern States from all the territory purchased. The least evil, therefore, the bill can bring to the people of the Southern States on entering it will be contention, harrassment, and litigation

But you will have a very inadequate conception of the importance of the territory taken from Texas by the bill, if you confine your views to Texas. If you will look at the map of the United States, you will perceive that the territory, proposed to be surrendered by Texas, lies throughout its whole extent along the western frontier of the Indian territory. This is now a slaveholding country, and must be considered as a part of the South. Place along their whole western boundary two non-slaveholding States, and how long will the Indians be able to maintain the institution of Slavery? If the agency of Congress is not used, to abolish Slavery in the Indian territory, this end can be easily accomplished by the very means now in operation against Slavery in the Southern States, which the Indian will have but little power to resist. The effect will be that the Indian territory, large enough for two more States, will be controlled by non-slaveholding States. Thus, by these two points in the [illegible] loose four large States in California, two in Texas, and two in the Indian territory. Nor is this all. The non-slaveholding States will be brought to the western boundary of Missouri and Arkansas along their whole extent, and will bound Texas on her whole northern and western frontier. Thus the Southern States will be hemmed in by the non-slaveholding States on their whole western border—a policy which they have declared essential to the end of abolishing Slavery in the Southern States. What can compensate the South for such enormous wrong and spoilation?

But this is not the end of your concessions by this report. We must not only yield to the interests, but to the prejudices of the Northern people. Slavery existed in the District of Columbia when Congress accepted the cession of the territory composing it from the States of Maryland and Virginia. No one can suppose that Maryland and Virginia, slaveholding States then and slaveholding States now, could have designed to give Congress any power over the institution of Slavery in this territory. Independently of the wrong to the people of the District, to emancipate their slaves, it would be an intolerable evil to have a District between them where emancipation prevails by the authority of Congress. Congress, in the bill reported as a part of the so-called compromise, now begins the work of emancipation, by declaring that, if any slave is brought into the District for sale, he shall be "liberated and free." If a slave is liberated because he is *brought into the District*, the next step to liberate him because he *is in the District*, is not difficult. The power to emancipate the slaves in the District of Columbia is thus claimed and exercised by Congress. Many of the ablest men of the South have denied that Congress possesses any such power, whilst all agreed, until lately, that for Congress to interfere with this institution, whilst Slavery existed in Maryland and Virginia, would be a gross breach of faith toward those States, and an outrage upon the whole South. How long will that facility which yields to the prejudice against the buying and selling of slaves be able to resist the greater prejudice which exists against the holding of slaves at all in the District of Columbia?

For all these sacrifices to the interests and prejudices of the people of the North, the South is tendered the last measure of the compromise—the fugitive slave bill as they propose to amend it. To understand the extent of the concession, the South receives on this point, we must look to the rights the Constitution confers.

The framers of the Constitution were perfectly aware that the General Government could have but little power to secure to them their fugitive slaves in the non-slaveholding States. The whole internal police of a State must be under the control of the State, and by this chiefly could slaves be recaptured. The Constitution, therefore, not relying on the Legislation of Congress alone, requires that a fugitive slave, escaping into a non-slaveholding State, shall be "delivered upon claim of the party" to whom he belongs. Fugitive slaves are put on the footing of fugitive criminals, and are to be delivered up by the State authorities. If these authorities do not enforce the requirements of the constitution, and aid in the recapture and recovery of fugitive slaves, Congress can do but little to enforce them. The bill providing for the co-operation of the few officers of the United States Government in a State is practically quite insufficient to accomplish its aim. What can they do in such a State as Pennsylvania to recover tugitive slaves? Yet if Congress does all that it can do, by legislation, to enforce the Constitution, it only does its duty to the South. There can be no concession or favor to the South, in giving her only what she has a right to have under the Constitution—unless, indeed, the constitution for her has no existence. The bill then is, in the first place, quite inadequate to restore to us our fugitive slaves, and in the second place, gives the South nothing but what she is entitled to. If this was all, there would be nothing in the bill for which we should concede anything to the North. But it is not all. Under the pretext of bestowing on us a benefit, it perpetrates a usurpation on the reserved rights of the States. It provides that a slave may arraign his master, by the authority of laws made by Congress, before the courts of the States and of the United States, to try his right to his freedom. If Congress can legislate at all between the master and a slave in a State, where can its power be stayed? It can abolish Slavery in the States. Thus a power is assumed in the bill which virtually extends the jurisdiction of Congress over Slavery in the States. And this is a benefit to the South! Under a guise of a benefit, the bill is useless as a remedy—and worse than useless in its usurpation. Such are the various measures which constitute this compromise.

We do not believe that many of the politicians, and still less that the people of the South who have expressed a willingness to support it, were aware of its purport. We fully appreciate and duly honor the motives of those who would restore tranquility to the country, nor shall we impugn in any form those who have assisted to frame or who have yielded a support to the measures. But, if our view of its provisions are correct, instead of a "compromise," it is a comprehensive scheme of emancipation; and if passed by Congress will only heap new indignities upon the South. So far from pacifying the people of the slaveholding States, it should arouse them to renewed efforts to vindicate their rights and institutions. Why the non-slaveholding States do not support these measures, we are unable to understand, unless it be that haughty fanaticism, inflated with success, disdains accomplishing its object by indirection. If these measures, however, were really a compromise in which the South had equal gains with the North, it would be of doubtful expediency for the South to propose it. Three times in Congress, during this controversy, the South has proposed the Missouri compromise, which has been three times rejected by the North. Twice she has proposed a compromise by which she consented to leave it to the courts of the United States to determine her rights. Instead of requiring sternly their recognition by Congress, fifteen soverign States have consented to be carried into the courts of the country and there to submit their sovereign rights in a territory belonging to them to their final arbitrament. Their humiliation did not win the respect or confidence of the North, and the proposition was twice rejected.

The South, in our opinion, might accept one other compromise, not because it is coextensive with our right, but because it has been twice sanctioned by those who have gone before us. If the North offers the Missouri compromise, to extend to the Pacific ocean, the South cannot reject it, provided a distinct recognition of our right to enter the territory south of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, is expressed in the compromise. We should take this line at a partition line between the two sections of the Union; and, besides this, nothing but what the constitution bestows. Although the Northern States would acquire by this compromise three-fourths of our vacant territory, they will have renounced the insufferable pretension of restricting and preventing the extension of the South, whilst they should extend indefinitely.

Having thus, fellow-citizens, laid before you a statement of your condition—your rights—and the remedy which, under present circumstances, you should accept, we leave you for a brief space of time. Until Congress adjourns, we cannot know what it will do or will fail to do. We must, therefore, meet again after its adjournment, to consider the final condition in which it will leave you. We recommend to you, and exhort you, to send delegates from every county and district in the Southern States to meet us when we again assemble. It is no ordinary occasion which has assembled us together. The Constitution and the Union it created, so long dear to your hearts, are to be preserved, and your liberties and your institutions maintained.

We have not hitherto been able to find room for the following admirably lucid and conclusive letter of I. T. Hopper to the Mayor, though indeed it could only have appeared in the last *Standard*, as its first publication in *The Tribune* was only a few days previous to the date of that paper. It puts the whole matter of the Anniversary riots in so plain a light that its publication now will not be considered at all out of date. The subjoined reply of the Mayor is also admirable in its way. Seeing how entirely unanswerable Mr. Hopper's letter is, like a prudent man he holds his tongue, and makes no attempt to defend himself when to do so would only show him to be as weak as he has been wrong.

THE LATE ANTI-SLAVERY RIOTS IN NEW YORK.

New York, 6th Mo. 4th, 1850.

To the Mayor: I have received thy favor of the 15th ult. and deem it incumbent on me to submit the following rejoinder.

In thy account of the conversation which took place at our interview on the 6th ult. thou sayest that thou informed me that the Chief of Police was instructed not only "to suffer no violence to be committed," but also "to suffer none to be threatened to be committed," and thou expresses surprise that the latter clause was omitted in my statement. I have no recolledtion of hearing it. If I had, I am sure I should have reminded the policemen of it on my return to the meeting. But the point is not important; and I refer to it only to assure thee that nothing could be further from my intention than to misrepresent in the smallest particular.

Thou art aware, I presume, and if thou art not there is abundant evidence that violence was threatened repeatedly, and continually in all our Anti-Slavery meetings, from the first at the Tabernacle to the fourth and last at the Hall of the Society Library. At the Tabernacle, Rynders announced with threatening gestures, that he would not allow W. L. Garrison to assail the President, "clenching his fist," says the *Herald*, a witness friendly to the riot, and "shaking it at Garrison." Doing this, he leaped from the gallery upon the platform, and was followed and surrounded by fifty to a hundred confederates, when a highly respectable citizen requested Capt. Raymond, a policeman, that he should arrest Rynders as a rioter. Raymond refused, declaring that he (Rynders) was doing nothing more than he had a perfect right to do. Rynders overheard the request and the policeman's reply. He cursed the citizen and made violent demonstrations of attack. Several about him held him back, but he was neither repulsed nor even rebuked by Raymond, who stood a little on one side but between them. The Hutchinson family attempted to allay the tumult by a song, whereupon Rynders threatened them with violence if they did not desist. Subsequently, after one of his own party had been heard with quietness and patience in all that he wished to say, and Frederick Douglass had risen to speak, Rynders enjoined upon him to avoid certain topics, or otherwise, "he would knock him off the stage." In all this and much more of the same kind, Rynders was backed by his fellow-rioters, who yelled, stamped and shouted, responding to their leader, "knock him down, turn him out." *The Tribune* describes the scene as the "wildest of uproars, shout, curses, and divers *threats*;" some of the women were greatly alarmed, uttered cries of terror, and retreated from the building. At this and subsequent meetings they were insulted by gross and ribald jests from Rynders and his crew.

At the Society Library on the following day, threats were continually uttered by the same band, somewhat augmented and obeying the same leader. Some one announced that the Police had come and "a movement," says *The Express*, "was made to eject him." "Put him out!" "Drive him out!" "I'll knock you down if you say anything more!" were some of the cries. All the presses, whether instigators of these disturbances or not, concur in describing a nearly uninterrupted scene of angry vociferation, terror and uproar for two hours. "Catcalls, demoniac yells, screams, hootings, shrieks, stampings and disgusting and vulgar obscenities," says *The Tribune*. "Uproarious shouts, confusion and uproar, anarchy and confusion, women affrighted," is the language of *The Herald*. *The Express* characterizes the scene thus: "Invading men howling like demons; Rynders shaking his fist; a crash near the organ; a suspicion that the house is coming down; a panic, a rush for the door; terrible confusion; some fisti-cuffing; fists swinging about in the air; ladies inquiring the way out; rowdies,

and a strong delegation from Park-Row, in complete command of the doors; anarchy and confusion; horrid noises; tear down the building and *set fire to it*. When it was announced at an early stage of the meeting that the Police had come, Rynders exclaimed in derision, "Oh, don't, don't; you'll frighten us to death."

If thou instructed the Chief of Police "to suffer no *threats* of violence," why was not that instruction obeyed? I leave that question for the present to to thee and him, contenting myself with having shown that a palpable and protracted case for the application of that instruction existed in the face of the Chief, and in defiance and "derision" of his power.

Although the outrages of which we complain consisted mainly of tumults, obscenities, yells, hootings and "threats to commit violence," they were not limited to these. At the Tabernacle a respected and estimable person from Pennsylvania was struck a heavy blow by Rynders, by the force of which the stranger recoiled two or three feet. At the Society Library, according to *The Herald*, several hats were beat down by blows on men's heads, causing a comic appearance of the wearers, and eliciting shouts from the rioters. A colored person was thrown by them down the broad aisle, the descent of which is steep, escaping without serious injury, but not without great fear. Rynders approached a person of distinguished worth and ability, who was addressing the meeting from the platform, and with insulting jeers, plucked him repeatedly by the beard.

That "the Chief of Police was present in sufficient force" at all these scenes, except perhaps the opening one at the Tabernacle, we have reason to believe. One of the city papers (*Sunday Mercury*) asserts that he was standing on the platform within a few feet of the leader of the rioters, where he having obtained undisputed possession of the house, said to one of the speakers, "There, you can speak now, but if you say anything disrespectful I'll knock you off the stage." "There were other members of our efficient Police," observes the same paper, "standing still nearer." Unhappily the only *official* proof which has been given of their presence, is derived from thy letter. Whatever be the true version of thy instructions, I submit that there was criminal negligence in some quarter in the enforcement of the law and that a wound has been dealt to law and authority which impairs its force and strengthens the mob for future conflict, and tends directly to the triumph of mob law, or to indiscriminate massacre in the streets.

The difference between us in regard to thy repetition at our interview of the charge of "blasphemy," is not important. I understood that the blasphemy which in all the indignation at it, there has been no attempt to specify, consisted in the manner of coupling the *name* of Christ with War and Slavery. In reply to a question, "whether slaves did not hold prayer meetings in honor of Jesus," Garrison said, "Yes, but not of a slaveholding or slave-breeding Jesus. The slaves believe in a Jesus that knocks off chains."

Garrison had been pursuing a line of argument to show the degeneracy of Christians and the Christian Church; that the popular tests of piety in all the churches are utterly worthless as evincing either love to God or love to man; that "the salt had lost its savor, and is good for nothing, but to be trodden under foot of men." But if there could be any doubt of W. L. Garrison's profound reverence for the character of Jesus, it would be removed by the proposition to which the previous argument was preliminary, viz: "That the object of the Anti-Slavery Society is beneficent, glorious, *Christlike*." It must be borne in mind that W. L. Garrison believes and feels with all the energy and enthusiasm of his powerful nature, that Abolitionism is the highest actual manifestation on earth of truth and beneficence. Is it blaspheming Christ to liken unto him that which he deems the purest and the holiest?

And who were they whose indignation at such blasphemy the Mayor apprehended it would be exceedingly difficult to restrain? A band of rioters, obscene and profane beyond the common measure of their kind; hired ruffians; the same men, in all probability, whose late outrages suddenly cut down, in the midst of life, a score of hapless victims, wholly unconscious of guilt or danger.

How did these *worthies* proceed to cast out blasphemy? By such pious exorcisms as the following: "Hell, what a hairy cuss! Say, mister, are you Jesus Christ?" This was addressed to C. C. Burleigh. "Ha, old Garrison! are you Jesus?" "Why don't Douglass shave that tall Christ (Burleigh) and make a wig for him." (Garrison.) "You d—d imposter, why don't you stop home with your blasphemy?"—When these vile fellows had got entire possession of the hall, having ousted those who had paid for it, they proceeded, under the supervision, as we may say, of the Chief of Police, to perfect their defense of the City's religion and propriety, by passing a [illegible] and damnatory of Anti-Slavery "scurrility and blasphemy." This was done on motion of a person who was formerly a member of the Police, but was expelled, being found too low a character to stay there. The question was put by Rynders, who had taken the *chair* of the President, and it was carried, says the *Herald*, "by a thunder shout of Ayes."

Thou dwellest much in thy letter, as thou didst in thy conversation, upon the fact that the rioters were permitted and invited by the President of the Society to take part in the discussions, and thou urged this as a justification of thy abandonment of it to the brutality and caprice of the mob. It is difficult to comment on this with that justice which is due to the subject, and the courtesy which is due to the chief Magistrate of the City. It is known to all that it is an original and fundamental principle of the Anti-Slavery Society to allow their opponents everywhere, and at all times, the privilege of being heard. Being unable on the late occasion to occupy the Tabernacle for much time, without interfering with the arrangements of another Society which had engaged it for the afternoon of the same day, we would have greatly preferred to have proceeded according to the order of our arrangements. Nevertheless, such is our respect for the principle of free discussion, and so high our appreciation of its general benefits, that when an opportunity to reply was demanded, we cheerfully acceded to it, waived the exercises of our published programme, and admitted our adversaries to share equally with ourselves, the privileges of our house. Methinks that a liberality so unusual, so friendly to the interests of truth, and so conciliatory to our fellow citizens of all opinions and of all parts of the country, did not forfeit our right to the ordinary protection of the Law, but rather increased it, if that which is perfect is capable of increase! Several of the city papers, both Daily and Weekly, have nobly vindicated and commended our principles and our claims in this behalf, and are entitled on that account, to our sincere thanks.

The example set by Abolitionists of admitting their adversaries into their newspapers and upon their platforms, may prove of inestimable value to our country. And now I ask, shall they, for a course so generous, so conducive to the progress of truth and the diffusion of knowledge, be delivered over to the tender mercies of the mob?

But my duty will not be discharged without going further and deeper into this matter than thou hast done. Thou art the Chief Conservator of the peace; thou art charged with the preservation of order and security; and the prevention of crime. Thy standing instructions to the powerful Police at thy disposal are, to use their utmost endeavors *to suppress all riots* and to disperse the rioters: and if they will not desist or will not disperse, to *arrest* as many of them as possible, or *drive them away*; and if there be disorderly conduct *tending* to a breach of the peace, thy instructions are that the Policemen *show their office*; and if the offenders do not immediately desist, and the disturbance be of a serious nature, *he is to take them into custody*. He must, to the utmost of his power, prevent assaults and breaches of the peace. It is the duty of the Police *to stop all tumults*, which *greatly disturb the public peace*, whether they occur in the streets or in buildings; and in all cases to look out and make early and prompt arrests of *old offenders*.

Every one of the four cases in which, by these instructions the police should interpose, and if need be, make arrests, occurred at both the meetings in question. When Rynders, an "old offender," said to have been the real leader of the Astor-place riots, and also convicted of other offences, enters a hall with a gang of fifty or a hundred confederates; when they utter abominable and defaming yells, threatening to knock the occupants down, and drag them out if they dare to disobey the behests of the gang; when they shout, "Tear down the building—set fire to it," so that the proprietors are put in great fear for the safety of their building and the valuable property therein—if riot is not then and there committed, then I must confess that I am ignorant of what constitutes a riot. I think, considering the well known object for which they were banded together and were recklessly striving, it was a suitable occasion for proclamation to the offenders to disperse under penalty of the Penitentiary.

Again, could anything tend more directly and manifestly to a breach of the peace than audacious and systematic interruption and total obstruction of the lawful business of a large meeting; swinging and flourishing fists above the persons of men, uttering insulting obscenities to delicate and respectable women, and putting them to fear? Thou must admit that there was a continual and imminent danger of breaches of the peace, of crimes and bloodshed. Lastly, the standing instructions, "to stop all tumults which greatly disturb the public peace," required energetic and decisive action of the Police at both the meetings of which I have spoken, and as I am informed at the intermediate ones which I did not attend; yet throughout the whole of these deplorable and disgraceful scenes, not a policeman "showed his office," not a caution or injunction was uttered, not a warning given, not an arrest attempted. In fact, the presence of the Police was in effect a license and encouragement to the rioters, for it relieved them from the apprehension of a surprise, and assured them of impunity,

If I have not already adduced sufficient to establish the culpability of the Mayor or of those under his orders and removable by him, take the further fact that several assaults and batteries were actually committed by the rioters in presence of the Chief and other policemen at both meetings.

But why was all this wrong inflicted upon the Anti-Slavery Society in this 17th year of its existence as a Society, and the 16th of its assembling annually in this city, without any wrong ever done or suffered by it?

Certain depraved presses, in several issues preceding the meetings, called upon the mob to be ready. Rynders is well known to be a familiar of Bennett, in whose paper the call was first made. After publishing in preceding papers several editorials designed to put the mob in train, Bennett puts out on the morning of our Anniversary, the following signal of attack: "When free discussion does not promote the public good, it has no more right to exist than a bad government, that is dangerous and oppressive to the common weal. It should be overthrown."

The *Globe*, being a fresh and somewhat callow candidate for Southern patronage, further instigated the mob to murder, pointing out Frederick Douglass (who was named in the programme to speak) as a "villian," deserving, for certain opinions, "to be struck dead." I think it was thy *duty*, as chief conservator of the peace, and preventor of crime, to cause these presses to be prosecuted for seditious libels. This would be the most direct and efficient way of damping the spirit they have stirred. However this may be, there can be no doubt that it was thy duty to guard with increased vigilance against an outbreak. So far from this, no police appeared until the riot at the Tabernacle began.

Bennett's demand was, that free discussion be overthrown. I do not think he is bloodthirsty, or that he desired personal harm to any one. He indicated simply the stopping of addresses, and this could be accomplished by mere noise, confusion and intimidation. Let us now see what indications the mob gave on this point. I find in *The Tribune's* report of the Society Library meeting, no less than five notes inserted in various parts, declaring that it was impossible to hear a speaker "ten feet," or "to hear one word in ten," or "to get an idea of what the speaker was saying," &c. Finally, it gives the following explanation:

"All the tumults seemed to be free from any real design to injure personally any one. The whole effort was to make a Babel of confusion so as to force the meeting to adjourn."

It is a further very significant fact that the Hutchinsons, so universally popular in this city, and so eagerly listened to on all occasions, were unable to obtain a hearing. This to my mind shows method in the mob. The pleasure of hearing the Hutchinsons would have beguiled into temporary quiet any mob except one premeditated and indoctrinated that nobody was to be heard.

When I called at thy office I claimed protection for the meeting so that the speakers might be heard and the business transacted Thou replied giving me assurance of protection against violence. I told thee that we had no personal fears To all my reiterated demands of protection for the meeting I got no response except that we should be protected against violence. Thou sayest also, threats of violence, but whether thou added that or not, it was the universal understanding in the meeting and about the city that nothing but personal violence committed on some one of us would induce the police to interfere; and that if we were to use violence by attempting to put disturbers out, we should ourselves be liable to be treated as disturbers. Thy special instructions mightily narrowed thy general instructions to the police under which, had they not been interfered with, our meetings would in all probability have enjoyed a perfect protection and quiet; for there is no Lynching, mobbing, persecuting spirit in this city against the Abolitionists now; though doubtless Bennett will try to convince his employers that there is. For that in part he very likely instigated the riot.

His report of my conversation with thee contains the following:

"*Mayor*—You shall be protected. The Chief of Police has sufficient force, and will act when necessity requires."

"*Mr. Hopper*—Yes, Mr. Mayor, that may be all very good, but we cannot be heard; a continual uproar is kept up, that no speaker can be heard, and the meeting cannot proceed. Now, Mr. Mayor, suppose we adjourn to meet at some future day, and only invite those who are friendly to [illegible] see that we are protected and allowed to proceed?"

"At this the Mayor shook his head and said, You shall be protected against all violence. [A smile from all present."]

Thou gave not the slightest intimation, that I heard, that such a meeting would receive protection different from the one then sitting.

When I proposed the alternative of an exclusive meeting, I was so simple as really to believe thou wouldst like us to come in a form in which thou could according to thy views of the law, afford us protection; but that proposition thou met with the same frigid negative, showing that, after all, thou thyself in reality cared nothing for the distinction so elaborately set forth by thee in thy letter, between the right of a free and that of an exclusive meeting, to thy protection.

Very respectfully thy friend, ISAAC T. HOPPER.

To C. S. WOODHULL, Mayor.

NEW-YORK, June 5, 1850.

Mr. ISAAC T. HOPPER—*Sir*: Your very long and friendly letter of the 4th inst. has been duly received. In reply, I have only time to say that I beg you will consider me as neither admitting nor denying, nor expressing any opinion whatever, upon any part of, or anything contained therein.

I am yours very respectfully,
(Copy,) C. S. WOODHULL.

PROF. AGASSIZ ON THE ORIGIN OF THE HUMAN RACE.

Prof. Agassiz delivered a lecture on this subject, on Thursday evening, before the Young men's Association of the Lawrence Scientific School in Cambridge, which was attended by a large audience of ladies and gentlemen. As we understood he did not wish his lecture reported, we shall attempt no more than a brief analysis. He commenced by observing that an incidental remark which he made on a particular occasion had been commented upon extensively, and brought out the discussion of a question which it was not his object to enter into. His object was, on that occasion, to speak of the unity of the human race simply as a question of Natural History But his remark had called forth discussions of the question with reference to religion and political condition. The question, how man was created, was entirely distinct from religion—a mere question of Natural History, and as such, as a philosopher, he claimed the right to discuss it. But he wished it distinctly understood that he took no ground in opposition to the Mosaic record, in the Genesis. We have no reference, he said, in that account, to any part of the world that was unknown to the ancients. He also disclaimed all idea of connecting this question with Slavery, or the political condition of the African race.

The unity of the human race and the diversity of their origin, he said, were two distinct questions. He acknowledged the unity of mankind, but this unity could exist in perfect consistency with the diversity of their origin.

There was a nother question, also, involved in this inquiry: "Do all men belong to one species, or are there different species of men?" But diversity of origin, he said, did not involve either the unity or plurality of species. He went at considerable length into an explanation of the subject of species, as understood in natural history, to prove this assertion.

The question also involved the limits within which organized beings are modified by circumstances and condition; and there were some ascertained facts, he said, which could be used as data in considering the subject. Skeletons had been found in Egypt, which had been buried for thousands of years, and with them were found certain seeds of plants, which had been planted and had grown. But these mummies and these plants correspond exactly to certain other plants and other human beings now to be found in very different circumstances. There appeared to be a regular plan, by which organized being, both plants and animals, were distributed over the earth, whereby the same plants and the same animals were constantly found in certain geographical positions. This was true of man, if we referred to the primitive, unhistorical races. And these geographical positions were almost entirely without reference to climate. He ran over a specification of the different varieties of certain animals and of the human race, which were found constantly in certain localities and positions; from which he drew the conclusion that these varieties could not have been produced by the modifying influence of climate and circumstances; hence that the distribution of the different varieties of the human race must have taken place, not at random, but with a regular plan—in short, that they were created in masses, in the positions which they originally occupied. Among other facts bearing on the point, he stated that the trout was always found in brooks, even high up in the mountains, where they could not have gone by emigration, and so also, there were certain varieties of fish that were only found in the lakes with no outlet, and these lakes contained the same kind of fish, in different and distant localities. And it was a remarkable fact, that the aborigines of America, with all its variety of climate, belonged to one and the same people

If men originated from a common centre, and were diffused over the earth, their present condition must have been produced by changes at or since the dispersion. But had it been so, there would have been more similarity between those which inhabit similar portions of the earth. He saw only one conclusion from these facts, and that was, that these changes could not have taken place by the modifying influence of circumstances, after migrating from a common centre; but that the non-historic or original races, must have been created in the place they occupied. And this view, he again assured his audience, was in perfect accordance with the Mosaic account. He had felt it bitterly, that he had been represented as pushing these views with the design of discrediting the Mosaic Record, or with any view of affecting the political condition of the Negroes, both of which he denied.

The impression we received from the lecture was, that, however these views might affect the mind of the naturalist, who studies nature more than revelation, there is no danger that the commonly received opinion on this subject, derived from the most obvious meaning of the Scriptures, will be shaken by any arguments drawn from facts in Natural History such as here presented.—*Boston Traveller*.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1850.

Mr. Webster's Memory.

It seems to be the general opinion of this country that Mr. Webster is a great man. Even those that think they can discern some slight flaws in the "entire and perfect chrysolite" of his moral character, join in the universal chorus of praise that goes up in glory of his intellectual powers. And yet it is singular that he should be lacking in a mental quality usually considered an essential element of a great intellect. We refer to the particular of *Memory*. Like the girl to whom Peter Simple lent half a crown in the faith that she would give him back two shillings change, when he next saw her, he has "a shocking bad memory!" We once knew a gentlemen who, being asked, after he had made some prodigious display of the faculty in question, "whether he had not a remarkably good memory?" replied, "A *good* memory! No, indeed—a very *bad* one, *for I forget nothing!*" This, however, is not the particular kind of badness under which Mr. Webster's memory labors It is the more common infirmity of not remembering what it should, and forgetting when it should not. It is a thousand pities that some system of Mneumonics could not be invented by some Whig philosopher for his especial benefit—some *Memoria technica*, like that contrived by Hoyle to enable young Whist-players to recollect what cards are out. For it cannot be denied that he has more than once sadly bungled his game for the want of some such mechanical assistance.

For example: In his famous speech of the 7th of March (for we have too much of the National leaven of reverence for great men to qualify the adjective by any preliminary particle), he nearly forgot, while enumerating the just grounds of complaint that the South had against the North, that the North had any at all against the South; while the little particular of his own State having been kicked out of the imperial dominions of magnificent South Carolina, for presuming to bring an action in the United States Court, and forbidden to return, under penalty of being treated as a felon, slipped his mind entirely! To be sure, she had taken no such notice of it as to impress the fact indelibly upon his mind; but had there not been a radical defect in this part of his mental organization, it is hardly possible that the association of ideas should not have suggested it to him at such a time. And, then, again, when his faithful "retainers" had laid themselves down in the kennel by his side, and he sneaked away and left them wallowing in the mire, it never occurred to him what a shabby thing he was doing. And when the bungling friend who performed this *hocus pocus* transformation, by authority, in the Boston [illegible] which," transposed from before to after the material sentence, so as to read, instead of "a bill, with some amendments, which, &c."—"a bill, which, *with some amendments* to it, I propose to support, *with all its provisions, to the fullest extent*"—we say that when he authorized Peeping Tom or Skipper Tarbox to make this extraordinary sentence, he had entirely forgotten the rudiments of Lindley Murray, and never once perceived that he was breaking poor Priscian's head all to flinders.

And when he was writing his letter of thanks to his humble friends at Newburyport ("*very umble*," like Uriah Heep, in Copperfield), and was sneering at Mr. Mann for saying "that a man may not lose his *horse* without a trial by jury, but he may his *freedom*," and was lamenting that Mr. M.'s "legal apprehensions were so crude and confused as to suppose a case which would prove, if Mr. Mann's horse strayed into his neighbor's field, he cannot lead him back without a previous trial by jury to ascertain the right," he forgot his law so far as to fail to perceive (and Mr. Mann himself, in his admirable reply, in his just indignation at the depravity of Mr. Webster's ideas, seems to have omitted to notice their fallacy in this particular) that Mr. Mann's case was perfectly well put, and covered the whole case. For, though Mr. Mann may lead back his estray horse from his neighbor's field, without a trial by jury, as the slaveholder may his slave, *if there be no denial of his claim*; still, if that neighbor denies Mr. Mann's property in the horse, and says it belongs to himself, then his right to a jury trial becomes perfect, and the analogy is entire and complete. It is the arising of the issue as to whether the horse belongs to Mr. Mann or Mr. Smith, and whether the man belong to Mr. Clay or to himself, that makes out the case for a jury trial. The most frantic Abolitionists have never proposed to interpose force to prevent a Slave who voluntarily chose to return to Slavery from following the bent of his inclinations. But if he deny the alleged *Status*, and plead "not guilty" to the charge of having stolen himself (a crime for which a devout and honorable woman of Worcester once rebuked Frederick Douglass to his face) from somebody else, then they humbly apprehend he is entitled to his trial by the country. But Mr. Webster had forgotten all this.

But it is quite in vain to attempt to specify all the proofs that Mr. Webster, notwithstanding his reputation for talent, must be regarded, as verdicts in lunacy cases have it, "of nonsane memory." But the very most remarkable proof of all has just come to light. After being thanked by Mr. Calhoun, with almost his last breath, for his expressed intention to support Mr. Mason's bill, "and its amendments, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent," which, it seems now, he did not mean to do; after having thus, Esau-like, obtained the blessing of the dying Patriarch of Slavery under false pretences; after having published four editions of his Speech, without an allusion to any proposed amendments of his own; after having spent three mortal columns in persuading the poor Newburyportians that the Constitution nowhere requires a trial by jury for one claimed as a Slave, with the strongest possible implication that such trial was not only inconvenient, but improper; all of a sudden he brings in the very Bill which he had scouted as absurd, unreasonable and impracticable, and all but denounced as unconstitutional, and, to crown the work, gives us to understand that he had had it in his desk ever since February! Never was there such an instance of absence of mind! Lord Chesterfield's "respectable Hottentot" never did anything like this. What are the poor dear Newburyport "retainers" to think? What a confusion must this last development make in their poor brains—probably never of the clearest! Mr. Webster will have much to answer for, if any of those unfortunate sufferers should go muddled and maundering to their graves, through the bewildering rapidity of his summersets.

Now these phenomena are capable of no satisfactory explanation, except on the hypothesis we have suggested. It is not to be supposed that "a sober ancient gentleman," on the verge of threescore and ten, could be guilty of the impropriety which the virtuous Houghnhms could only describe by the periphrasis of —"saying the thing that is not." We all know Mr. Webster to be an "honorable man," with a thousand or more "retainers," all honorable men, too (except they that are *reverend*), ready to maintain his character, or perish in the attempt. Nobody is bold enough to deny that he is, like the Lord Angelo, "a gentleman of all temperance;" that his walk in this world is of the apostolic model—"holy in all manner of conversation"—"owing no man anything." If it were possible that any infidelity could exist on any of these points, the unbelievers should be referred for their confusion to Professor Stuart, at Andover, who will be ready with an *Exegesis*, garnished (not having the fear of Kingsley or Conant before his eyes) with any given amount of quotations, more or less authentic, to clear up all disputed passages in his life. We humbly conceive that we, too, have proved ourself worthy to stand in the worshipful company of the Defenders of the Defender of the Constitution; for we apprehend that we have made the best defence for him that has yet been attempted. In virtue of this fellowship, we would entreat our co-worker, Professor Stuart, to revise the epitaph on our friend with which he concludes the great work of his life, and, omitting the Latin (of which the "*Justum et tenacem*" might be construed by the wicked in an evil sense, "tena city of purpose" not being usually regarded as one of Mr. Webster's attributes), and simply to substitute the common, but, in this case, eminently appropriate, formula of the head-stone,

"Sacred to the Memory of
DANIEL WEBSTER. E. Q.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

[PHONOGRAPHIC REPORT BY DR. STONE.]

FANEUIL HALL, THURSDAY EVENING, MAY 30.

SPEECH OF WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

If I were sure that there is here a candid disposition to hear something in regard to the appalling condition of three millions of our countrymen in chains at the South, I should be glad to occupy a very short time in holding them up to the view of this great assembly, in their wretchedness, their degradation, their hopeless despair. If I thought they were not altogether given over to popular contempt, derision and hatred,—so that, in the present excited state of feeling, there seems to be no willingness to listen to the story of their wrongs,—I should like to speak directly to the question of their enslavement.

But, sir, I am now going to forget them all—not in reality, but for the occasion. While I stand on this platform, I will not think of their fetters; I will not speak of their stripes; I will not tell how they are herded with four footed beasts, denied all light and knowledge, plundered of every right. No, sir. Let them be forgotten! If it has come to this, men of Massachusetts, that you care nothing for their wrongs; that you are unwilling to hear their groans; that you refuse to mark their tears, or count their sighs: that you are hostile to their liberation: be it so, at least, for this occasion.

Sir, it is not a question, to-night, about Southern slaves, which is first in order; but it is, where do we ourselves stand? What is the freedom that we enjoy? If the slaves at the South may be justly held in bondage, are we at the North to lose our liberties? If black men may lawfully be made chattels, what is to be our condition? Shall we enjoy the right, as Massachusetts men, as Bostonians, under the Constitution, peaceably to assemble together to consult about common grievances and common dangers; or, with the liberties of the black man, is that right to be cloven down forever? If the slaves of the South may not speak their thoughts, have we of the North a right to speak ours? That, sir, is the question for us to settle here in Faneuil Hall.

What is the freedom of speech enjoyed on the other side of the Atlantic? They have a republic in France—a republic in form—as we have here. Is the liberty of speech, or of the press, tolerated therein? No. Who does not know that the despotism of Louis Napoleon is as stringent as was that of Louis Philippe? that every outspoken friend of freedom and equality is under the ban of the government? that every press, which dares to arraign existing tyranny, is proscribed, and its editor heavily fined or thrown into prison? (1)

What is the liberty of speech in Italy? What is it in Austria? What is it in Russia? No man may attempt to exercise it in those countries, except at the peril of his life.

Now, every American says—and says truly—that the reason, the only reason of this is, because despotism is triumphant there; because the people are ground down to the dust; because the tyrants are conscious that they cannot maintain their position in any other manner. That is just the whole story; for if there were no tyranny there, then would freedom of speech and of inquiry be allowed to the fullest extent.

Well, sir, how is it in this country? We live in a republic, as the French people do. Have we the liberty of speech more than they?—I mean on all subjects, in all parts of the country? Every one knows that, in the slaveholding States of this Union, no man may dare to give free utterance to his thoughts, on one particular subject, at least,—the last subject to seal up the lips of a freeman, that of chattel Slavery—whatever else he may be permitted to say; for he must speak by permission, if he speak at all. There is one subject, I say, in that vast section of the country, which no man can discuss safely, and at the same time fearlessly; for if he should boldly proclaim—'I abhor Slavery in every form, most of all that which makes men, women and children marketable commodities—I regard the negro as a man and a brother—I am in favor of immediate and unconditional emancipation—he is ('hear, O Heaven! and give ear, O Earth!') a doomed man, upon him will be visited the vengeance of the Lynch law, for him the dungeon yawns, and peradventure, he must die a felon's death!

Why this prohibition of free speech? Why this murderous treatment, in case that prohibition is manfully disregarded? Precisely for the same reason that exists for the suppression of thought and speech in Europe. Tyranny will not, cannot bear investigation.

'The thief doth fear each bush an officer.'

So much for the South. There is nothing in Italy, nothing in Austria, nothing in Russia, more ferocious or more terrible in its opposition to the spirit of liberty, than exists in the slaveholding States.

How is it with ourselves, on Puritan soil—in the old Bay State? The excitement, the confusion, the wild uproar, created among us by a free discussion of this question of Slavery—what does it indicate? Have we a right to speak our own thoughts, or not? Remember, I am not talking about the Southern slaves, but endeavoring to ascertain whether we have any rights of our own.

Be the consequences what they may, we are here to protest against Slavery—who doubts it? We are here to advocate the cause of impartial liberty—who doubts it? We are here for the purpose of completing the revolution begun by our fathers, and left by them to be perfected by their descendants. So far as they struck for independence, and trampled the tyranny of the mother country under their feet, they did well. But, alas! they did not break every yoke; the fetters of their own bondmen remained heavy and strong. It is for us to perform what they left undone, and to decree that there shall not be tolerated on the American soil a despot or slave.

Sir, as a people, we are free to criticise the deeds and institutions of nations far removed from us. We criticise their manners and their morals—strongly denounce what we deem unjust, and warmly applaud what we find worthy of commendation among them. Whether it be the monarch on the throne, or the minister in the cabinet, we record our opinions of him and his acts in plain terms, and with all possible freedom Now, wherein is our justification to be found for this intermeddling? What right have we to talk of persons out of our own country? How dare we to rebuke, ay, to anathematize the tyranny of Russia and of Austria? We dare to do this, because we claim to be freemen, and maintain that despots are everywhere to be execrated. We are freemen, and therefore are not afraid of the Austrian Emperor or the Russian Autocrat. We are not afraid of anybody outside of our country—not we! Are we afraid of anybody inside of it?

Again, I ask, what right have we to meddle with the affairs of other nations? Yet it will be recollected that, only a short time since, the most distinguished leader of the Democratic party, General Cass, stood up in his place in the United States Senate, and made an earnest and eloquent speech in vindication of the right of the American Government to manifest its abhorrence of Austrian despotism, in a most pointed form. He moved that our diplomatic intercourse with Austria be suspended, and forcibly urged the duty and importance of registering a strong moral protest, in relation to her sanguinary treatment of the noble Hungarians. He maintained that, if we could not directly intefere, there was one thing we had a right to do—to raise a note of remonstrance, that would cause even a Haynau to cower, and the despot of Russia to tremble.—Such a testimony, he said, would sink deeply into the heart of the civilized world. General Cass was right in this estimate of moral power: He did not exaggerate the potency of a rectified public sentiment arrayed against atrocious cruelty.

Mr. Chairman, if we may travel out of our country with all possible freedom around the globe, and assume the right to concern ourselves with the affairs in which we are not immediately interested—with nations, for whose government we are not responsible; if we may do this, I say, and no one be found to raise his voice against it, may we not exercise as much liberty in examining our own institutions, as we do in reviewing those of other countries? If it is not impertinent, if it is not improper, nay, if it is commendable and patriotic, for us to censure what is cruel and despotic in Austria, is it impertinent, is it improper, is it not equally commendable and patriotic, for us to denounce what is atrocious and indefensible in this republic? In all such matters, it seems to me that it is most fit that we should first look at home As an apostle of old said, 'Let judgment begin at the house of God'

Sir, we are living under a despotism, a most appaling despotism; under a power which does not take away political rights merely, but, so far at least as one sixth portion of our teeming population is concerned, all that belongs to manhood. Yes, millions of our countrymen are in chains to-night? You know that they are held as property, and bought and sold like beasts. You know that it is illegal to give them even the rudiments of education. You know that they are driven to their unrequited toil with the blood-stained lash, and subjected to every privation. You know that if they attempt to escape by flight, they may be legally hunted with blood-hounds, and shot down with rifles. You know it all. And I ask has it come to this, that we are not, even in Faneuil Hall, to protest against such injustice, to denounce such barbarity, to execrate such tyranny, to declare our undying attachment to the cause of universal freedom? (Prolonged cheering.)

Now, sir, I appeal to the good sense of this vast assembly, whether there should be tolerated in our country any thing which is opposed to free discussion; which dreads investigation; which relies on a lawless mob, or the summary infliction of Lynch law for its protection; which, like the voice of concious Guilt continually cries—

'Put out the light, and then—put out the light!'

which after the manner of despotism in all ages exclaims—'Let us have nothing but darkness here! Let us insist on all tongues being mute! The warm pulsations of the heart must be suppressed! There is security only in stagnation and gloom!'

The defenders of Slavery maintain that it is a valuable institution, and cannot be overthrown without disastrous results. Well, fellow-citizens, does a good thing skulk from the light? Is an excellent thing afraid to be looked at? Is that on which the true prosperity of the country is based, something which cannot be handled and must not be examined? Absurd! Every reflecting man knows, that whatever practice, custom, or institution forbids discussion or dreads scrutiny, must be incapable of defence; or, at least, justly subjects itself to suspicion as inherently vicious.

How is it with us at the North? What is there in our agricultural, manufacturing or commercial pursuits,—in any of our institutions 'peculiar' or common,—that may not be investigated, censured and assailed, without the risk of personal outrage? Nothing! And why is this? Because we have confidence in their utility; or, if it can be shown that they are oppresive or dangerous, we are willing to be instructed.

In this whole country, nothing should be allowed to exist on the soil, for one moment, which cannot challenge as close a scrutiny, and welcome as unfettered a discussion. Is it not so?

Now, then, if Slavery be a system worth preserving—if it be a desirable condition for those who are under it—it can be shown by fair argument, by manly reasoning, by undeniable facts; shown too, not merely by the slaveholders, but by the testimony of far better witnesses—the slaves themselves! O, sir, it is said the slaves are happy; they are contented; they desire nothing more. Well if this be true, I tell you that a happy and contented people are able to give utterance to their feeling, and to let the world know their wishes. I therefore turn to them, and ask—'Are you happy as slaves, that you do not desire to be freemen?'

[Cries of 'Fire!' and considerable disturbance, which lasted for some minutes. A person who fired a torpedo was arrested, and removed from the Hall by the police. Order being at length restored, Mr. Garrison proceeded:]

'Sir, these three million of slaves are voiceless, for they dare not speak of their wrongs.

There is a good deal said against the Abolitionists, because they avow themselves to be disunionists.—What do you mean by union? Are the American people one body? ('Yes!') Be it so! We are one body—East and West, North and South; one body but many members. Now, then, 'whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.' Hence it is plain, that if there be any thing which tends to injure, degrade or peril one portion of the country, or which is destructive to the welfare and prosperity of the nation, we are all the more entitled to speak freely in regard to it, from the fact of our consolidation: therfore, it cannot be truthfully said, that we have nothing to do with what is done in the South, touching the continuance of Slavery in that section; for the growth of that foul system threatens a general catastrophe.

Sir, I ask, whether the Southern slaveholders are at all squeamish in discussing any question pertaining to the interests of New England? Do they not both claim and exercise the right to speak of our institutions, our manners and customs, just as freely as they please? Does any one in New England object; or is any one offended? No. We acknowledge their right to dissent from us, to warn and rebuke us; and when they come among us, we neither insist on conformity nor threaten to tar and feather them if they dare to tell us what they think of us.

On the other hand, is nothing of freedom left to us, men of New England? Have we no right to sit in judgment upon anything done in the slaveholding South? Remember no one here proposes to act unlawfully or unconstitutional. We only claim a common right to utter our honest convictions manfully, and to enjoy protection in so doing. Yet, the moment we turn our eyes southward, (we cannot go there in person, except at the peril of our lives,) and speak in terms of honest indignation against its vast system of blood, and crime, and tyranny, unparalleled beneath the sun, there are those who admonish us to mind our own business, and to cease meddling with other people's affairs! And yet these very people tell us that we are members of one body,—involved, for weal or woe in one common destiny,—and embraced in a common union! Then I say, if one portion of the country be foully recreant to God and liberty, and the other does not lift up a voice of remonstrance against such a suicidal policy, we must go down in one common ruin!

The Union of our country! Mr. Chairman, I am not a disunionist in an evil sense. I advocate no disunion of freemen. I am for Union! [Sensation.] I am—as Daniel Webster said he was, in reply to Hayne of South Carolina—for 'LIBERTY and UNION now and forever!' [Immense enthusiasm.] For *where liberty truly exists, there will be union, of course*. But I am not for SLAVERY and UNION, or for any compact of which Slavery is recognized as one of its elements, or in which Slavery finds any security. This is the issue we make before the country and the world. The American Union is tainted, corrupted, cursed by Slavery. We are ruled by the Slave Power, which is omnipotent to raise to all places of honor and preferment, to strike down those who occupy those places, and to shape the destiny of the Republic as now organized. Now, this is our declaration: God never yet made it possible for freemen and tyrants to coalesce, or for Liberty and Slavery to dwell together. Be not cheated by a name. The American Union, so called, is not a union in reality. It is a despotism, after all; and, for one, I declare my uncompromising hostility to despotism in every form, call it what you may, and howsoever it may disguise itself. [Cheers and groans.]

Well, there appears to be a dissent from this. [Laughter and hisses.] Let us have the freest expression, and yet preserve our self-respect. I repeat it: we are living under a despotism, which we have christened by the name of 'Union,' and so are deluded by the notion that we are freemen.

One word further in regard to the free expression of opinion. Doubtless, there are some in this assembly who neither sympathize with the slave, nor desire to utter a word for his deliverance; and, therefore, they may see no evil in preventing, by violence others from pleading his cause. But, remember, we are creatures of change. Remember, we do not want the right to talk to-night only, but to-morrow also, in accordance with our convictions. It may be that, to-morrow, better thoughts—at least, other thoughts—may take possession of our minds, and we may see in that poor manacled slave the image of Jesus, and a brother man, and may wish to cry aloud for his emancipation. Some of you are Democrats—others are Whigs. As such, your particular party enlists your feelings and secures your allegiance. You may not dream of changing your sentiments, and perhaps may not do so; but that is not the question. What, if to-morrow, you should see good reason for altering your position; ought you not to have the right to do so? Beware, then, how you trample upon a principle, the sacrifice of which interferes with your freedom as men, as much as it does with ours, who happen to espouse an unpopular cause.

Let me appeal to the Democrat portion of this audience. Democracy is based upon the Declaration of Independence, is it not? It goes for the freedom and equality of the entire human race—in theory at least. Well, what is your freedom in this 'glorious' Union, under your 'glorious' Constitution? Test this matter practically. You travel south of Mason and Dixon's line, and there behold the slave coffle, driven in chains to a distant market—the human flesh auction—the scarred and crouching slaves on the plantation. Indignant at such a spectacle, you loudly exclaim against it; you pronounce it inhuman and anti-democratic, to the last degree; you avow your sympathy with the slave as 'a man and a brother.' What then? None will rally more promptly to your tarring and feathering than your southern democratic brethren! And this is your 'glorious' Union! [Applause and hisses] Is it not so? I draw no fancy sketch—I exaggerate nothing. Yes, you may cry out—'I am an American citizen, from the Old Bay State, and a member of the great Democratic party!'—it will avail you nothing If you persist in denouncing Slavery, by democratic hands you shall be outraged, and peradventure choked to death! You can live in safety there, only by not daring to be a man, and by making slaveholding and slave-breeding compatible with genuine democracy! What a 'glorious' Union!

How is it with you Whigs? You profess to be quite as democratic as the Democrats themselves. You also hold to the Declaration of Independence. You believe in preserving the Union. And what is your liberty under it? Let one of you venture to the South, and proclaim uncompromising opposition to the slave system—let him demand the immediate li

Slavery, and God will give us peace, prosperity, safety, in largest measure—not till then. Then shall we have a 'glorious' Union in fact, as well as in form, such as the world has never seen. I am here to advocate such a Union, that justice may triumph and liberty prevail universally. (Repeated cheers.)

Who are they who would clamor down freedom of speech, on the ground that it cannot be safely tolerated? Who are they who deny the right of secession, and declare that revolution is an treasonable act?—Braggarts, who talk of their Puritan blood, and boast of their revolutionary sires! Let them not dare to insult the memory of Washington, by raising a shout when his name is mentioned. Our fathers never claimed infallibility; they never said, 'We cannot err;' they never said, 'Our government is perfection itself, and so admits of no change, and calls for no amendment.' They exhibited no such folly. They left in the Constitution a provision for you to alter or abrogate it, as clay is moulded in the hands of the potter.

So in regard to a change in the form of government they imposed no yoke on their descendants. Among the 'self-evident truths' which they recognized in their Declaration of Independence was this: 'that when any form of government'—mark you that!—'when *any* form of government becomes oppressive, it is not only the right, but the duty of the people to throw off such government, and to provide new safeguards for their future security.' This is the lesson of rebellion they have taught us! Do we indeed revere their memories? Are we worthy to be called their sons?

'Now, by our fathers' ashes, where's the spirit
Of the true-hearted and th' unshackled gone?
Sons of old freemen, do we but inherit
Their *names* alone?

Shall our New England stand erect no longer,
But stoop in chains upon her downward way..
Thicker to gather on her limbs and stronger,
Day after day?'

The revolution we stand here to advocate is a moral one. We counsel no shedding of blood. We implore that our enslaved countrymen may be instantly liberated. We will not give any aid or countenance to their enslavement, however strong the temptation or liberal the reward. Is this a crime? Is this to be hissed at? What, then, is virtuous in action or glorious in example?

Too long have we been corrupted by Slavery; too long spit upon by it; too long subjugated to its fiendish will. But, thank God, the spirit of liberty is rising! In spite of opposition, fierce and formidable, that spirit is going on, 'conquering and to conquer.' We have no cause for discouragement or dismay, It is for tyrants alone to tremble! Whatever compromises, plots, coalitions may be formed, in Congress or out of it, to put down this great movement, as well attempt to stop the swing of the ocean when the tempest is at its height, as to crush or intimidate the spirit which animates its advocates.

'Glory to them who die in this great cause!
Mobs, judges, can inflict no brand of shame,
Or shape of death, to shroud them from applause!
No, manglers of the martyr's earthly frame,
Your hangman fingers cannot touch his fame!
Still in this guilty land there shall be some
True hearts, the shrines of Freedom's vestal flame:
Long trains of ill may pass unheeded dumb—
But Vengeance is behind, and Justice is to come!'

(Applause—confusion—and 'three cheers for Webster!'

SPEECH OF WENDELL PHILLIPS.

We have been honored with a glorious audience in Faneuil Hall. There has been a report current of a great pro-slavery speech made lately in the city of Washington. I am inclined to think it a mistake; for I have never seen such Anti-Slavery gatherings before, in the city of Boston, as I have witnessed this week. You know Falstaff thought that if he 'was not witty himself, he was the cause of wit in others; and of a certain great man, who shall be nameless, it can with truth be said, that if he is not Anti-Slavery himself, he is certainly the abundant cause why other men come to Anti-Slavery meetings. (Applause.) The Abolitionists, then, are bound to make their very best bow to the discussions that have gone on in Congress for the last six months.

Nothing less than a scene like this would come up to the revolutionary precedent which our fathers have set us. ('Good.') It was here under this roof that the first rude conflict of opinion was ever witnessed betwixt Liberty and Slavery, on this side the waters. And if the ark of your Constitution founders in this discussion, one thing will ride out the tempest, and that is, the fame of Faneuil Hall. (Cheers.)

As for this matter of the Union, Mr. Chairman, we know in what a glorious strain it has been addressed. Let me quote the noblest lines, certainly, that have been given to it, from the pen of Longfellow:

'Thou, too, sail on, O ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of coming years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.
We know what master laid thy keel,
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Where shaped the anchors of thy hope.'

This is the Union you idolize. The present crisis, the question which the nation is now called to answer, will *prove* its value. 'When the sea is calm, all boats alike show mastership in floating.' The ship which deserves so lofty a pæan as that, should be one which can outride any storm. If your Constitution cannot abide free speech, if it has not vigor enough even to free slaves, cease boasting of its merits.

'Give me where I can stand, and I will move the world,' said the old philosopher. Our fathers, when they framed this Union, supposed they were giving us a platform on which man could stand and work miracles. It has been only holiday sport for the last sixty years; we have sailed with gay banners, over laughing tides. And now, for the first time, the storm gathers in the North. It darkens the whole horizon. A fierce struggle between the very elements of our political being makes every beam and timber creak. The question is forced on every American Are these schools, this religion, this government of ours worth anything, under and through which to unfold and hold up, aid and carry forward humanity? If they are not, like shrivelled parchment, throw them aside, and make better. But if they are, if your Union shall ride out the agitation, well and good. When it has freed the slave, when it has proclaimed 'liberty to all the inhabitants,' you shall find no man surpass the Abolitionists in their eulogy of the Instrument which has been found capable of this most unexpected virtue. Do not think us irreconcilably divided from you. O, no! It is certain men whose opinions do not keep over night that are most in the way of popular agreement on this subject. Dr. Johnson said, you know, 'you could make a good deal of a Scotchman if you caught him young.' You can make something of the speech of Daniel Webster, if you get it fresh. (Laughter.) But mind that you get the last edition. (Renewed merriment.)

It is possible that I may now address some of the 983 laymen and the 4 Doctors of Divinity, the retainers of that illustrious—or notorious—man. ('Three cheers for Webster—Three more—Three for Old Zack.') On the 7th of March, jury trial for fugitive slaves was to be opposed, 'in all its provisions, to the fullest extent.' That pledge got 987 endorsers. But somehow, it got very many critics also; and so, after a while, it leaks out that Mr. Webster had in his desk, but forgot it, on amendment proposing jury trial. The remembrance, the lucky remembrance, of this fact, helped him. Alas for the 987 whom it left endorsing his omissions! his forgetfulness! But, lo! let them be comforted, since Mr. Webster soon proved to the Newburyport Committee that there was at least one 'insuperable' objection to jury trial in such cases! That argument again helps the retainers, and soothes their wounded feelings; it is hardly worth while to say where it leaves Daniel and his tardily remembered amendments! But presto! up jumps the statesman, a few days after, and submits to the Senate, not an amendment, but a Bill securing this 'impracticable' right of jury trial—and a Bill that had lain in his desk since February! And there let us leave Daniel, the Retainers, and the Newburyport Committee, to settle the confusion together.

Is there not a story, Mr. Chairman, in Joe Miller, of one who borrowed a kettle, and was sued for returning it broken? And his plea in defence was, that 1st. It was broken when he borrowed it; 2d. It was whole when he returned it; 3d. He never borrowed it at all! Our Senator must have had that case in his eyes, during this whole matter. 1st. No jury trial at all, Mr. Mason; your bill is the thing. 2d. O, no, you 'misunderstand me, Mr. Atlas-Old-Whig; I had an amendment securing jury trial in my desk, only it slipped my mind! 3d. Nonsense! Gentlemen of Newburyport, there is one 'insuperable' objection to jury trial in this matter! 4th. What is all this noise about? This jury trial thunder is all mine! I have had a Bill securing it to fugitive slaves in my desk ever since February!!

There used to be an old Jew who lived by the side of the Federal Street Theatre, known to many of you, or if not, known to your fathers, by the name of Moses Wallack. He sold lottery tickets. One day, a countryman going toward State street passed the Jew's office. He beckoned him in, and sold him a ticket. When the verdant stranger reached State street——

A Voice—I knew him.

Mr. Phillips—Any relative? (Laughter.) When the stranger reached State street, he found the number of that very ticket he had just bought had drawn a prize, and he thought he had made a fortune in a moment.—And so, not remembering, Mr. Chairman, that in that day there were two or three classes in lotteries—Class No. 1, Class No. 2, Class No. 3, &c., and which often contained the same numbers—he hurried back to the old Jew, and exclaimed, 'There is my ticket, 987'—(the identical number of the retainers)—[I see it has drawn ten thousand dollars!' 'Look at the *cash*,' was the sneering reply. So when Mr. Wm. M. Rogers, or any body else, shall print approval of any doctrines of Mr. Webster's speech, the question will be, *Which edition?* ('Reiterated applause. You are a fanatic.') Yes! I am a fanatic, in a day when Liberty is gagged that stocks may sell at par, when pulpits preach peace instead of purity, and statesmen laugh at any higher authority than the parchment of human laws, thank God I am a fanatic, as such men judge fanaticism! (Applause.)

The edition, to be sure, does not matter much to our friend Moses Stuart. Enough for him, that the great man has said it; and he sets to work to trim, bend, screw, and forget, till morals, science, law and religion are made to conform to the *ipse dixit*. 'Tis only the old art of construing Genesis anew, as each successive hypothesis of geology gets uppermost. Now Moses is Vulcanian, now Neptunian. I mean Moses the Jew; our Moses sits Websterian for ever. This sagacious Statesman, seeking to 'gild refined gold and paint the lily,' has troubled himself to find out another argument against the Wilmot Proviso, in addition to those of the great Daniel, and the 'will of God.' His chief point seems to be that it is of no use whatever to apply it to the territories, since the moment they become States they will be entitled to set up Slavery, if they choose! Indeed! 'Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will surely depart therefrom.'—Thus the text reads, does it not? Build up a Territory on the basis of Freedom, and when it becomes a State it will *probably introduce Slavery*! Excellent logic!

After all, like the ass who tried to play the spaniel, our Northern men cannot play traitors to any advantage. They get the shame of the attempt, none of the advantage of success. Mr. Clay has headed our Senator North and South. Whatever is gained from this game goes to him. All is grist to 'the mill-boy of the Slashes.' When one sees the tact, quickness and sagacity of the Kentuckian, and the slow, cumbrous, and self-exposing movement of the Yankee, it brings to mind Fuller's picture of Ben Johnson and Shakespeare:—'Many were the wit-combats betwixt these: which two I beheld like a Spanish great gallion and an English man-of-war. Master Johnson, like the former, was built far higher in learning, *solid but slow in his performances*; Shakspeare, like an English man-of-war, lesser in bulk, but lighter in sailing, *could turn with all tides*, tack about, and take advantage of all winds, by the quickness of his wit and invention.' If this last be not Henry Clay, who is it? (Cheers.)

Let us leave politics. Suppose I now anticipate Mr. Gliddon, and unroll the mummy of Winter Street Church. (Laughter, and cheers for Christianity.)—The Christianity which is at peace with the oppressor is no Christianity for the oppressed. Dr. Rogers is reported to have said that the disunionists would in the next world sit cheek by jowl with Judas. (Applause in the rear.) There is certainly one point of resemblance between Judas and the disunionists. We read that when Judas had taken the thirty pieces of silver and saw his Lord was condemned,—but mark you, if it is thought bad taste to introduce here an illustration from that book we all look upon as sacred, let it be remembered the most blasphemous of us fanatics never touched that most tempting comparison in the case of the great Northern Traitor, but confined ourselves to Benedict Arnold; if it be lacking in taste, remember it was a clergyman who lent us the illustration; once introduced, in using it, I only follow in the footsteps of my illustrious predecessor: (merriment) Now we read that when Judas had taken the thirty pieces of silver, and found that his Lord was condemned, he repented: mark you that! *He repented*, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver, saying, 'I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent blood,' When the abolitionist first awakens from his dream of historical admiration for these great men, who enacted their high parts in the political drama of our country, when the Constitution rises before him, 'betraying innocent blood,' then it is that he like Judas, *repents*, confesses that he has sinned in that he has betrayed innocent blood, brings back the 'thirty pieces of silver'!—his citizenship and ballot—and refuses all further allegiance, striving by every sacrifice to atone for the wrong he has unconsciously committed. Alas! the slave *could* point to some who have followed Judas thus far—to sell him for fine words—'Glorious Union'—'Fame of our fathers,' for extended country—for personal ease—for office—for the ballot. Would they could turn over one other page of the story, and imitate that 'repentance,' disdaining to be slave-hunters and slave-jailors for any silver, however weighty—any land, however broad—any peace, however specious.

Mark, you! there was a great man once, who went down to Washington, and saw on the block of the Slave Power 'the image of God cut in ebony' for sale for 'thirty pieces of silver.' His past life—the land of his birth—the heart of the age, echoed the cry of the bondman, and bade him lift up his mighty voice in behalf of justice and humanity. But custom, base laws, old habits, bright hopes first lulled him into silence, then woke him to treason. He bowed his vassal head; he counselled Massachusetts—his mother—to forget her 'prejudices.' (Groans.) When *he repents*, he will be worthy to 'go up higher,' and stand by Judas.

You know the old story of Rip Van Winkle. When he had been asleep twenty years, he woke up one Sunday morning: saw his grandson, and in the confusion of his first waking, said to those who stood around him, 'I am not myself, I am somebody else. That is I, yonder.' So in that other state to which we are all tending if Judas should wake up, having thrown away his thirty pieces of silver, he would say. 'I am not myself—that is myself, yonder—that great Statesman, who made a speech in March—(Mirth and hisses. Great noise and confusion. The officers remove two or three disorderly individuals from the hall.)

Let me congratulate this triumphant assemblage on the progress of our cause. I maintain it is a triumphant assemblage. It shows an impulsive, enthusiastic people. I remember that in this very hall I was told some twelve months since, by one of the most eloquent clergymen of Boston, that if ever he became an abolitionist, he would show us what an abolitionist was—He said, 'I was born a Virginian, and that hot blood boils in my veins. If I become an abolitionist, all that Garrison has said will be tame in the comparison.' In this sense, I like your spirit to night. It convinces me that when you are thoroughly converted to the doctrines of the Anti-Slavery cause, you will make glorious abolitionists, every one of you, morally, six feet and four inches high. (Prolonged applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN. I wish to say one word to the well-dressed persons here to night, and who consider themselves as belonging to the educated classes, apparently the students of liberal professions, or the younger members of the commercial class. You may think that you are not seen in the attempt to create disturbance. I tell you I can see the face of every man in this room I see the faces of many who will be ashamed to have it told to-morrow to their brothers and their mothers and their sisters, that they have been participants in an attempt to create a disgraceful interruption of a public meeting.

The Convention will now adjourn with three cheers for the immediate abolition of Slavery. (Reiterated plaudits.)

SPEECH OF PARKER PILLSBURY.

[Mr. Pillsbury was unable to commence his remarks for several minutes, in consequence of a disturbance in the hall.]

The Chairman—I would appeal again to the orderly and peaceable portion of the audience to remain quiet. The police have carried out the ringleaders.

Mr. Pillsbury—I suppose most of these here are in favor of order. We shall determine whether Boston is in the hands of the mob or not. I am very glad we are having it demonstrated whether Boston contains a law-abiding people. ['Hurrah.'] It has been boasted, in behalf of Boston, that a mob could not rule here. We shall see.

Do you suppose, if those men who were here seventy-five years ago, had then witnessed what has now occurred in Faneuil Hall, that these walls would have ever shuddered with the eloquence of a Hancock or an Adams, in favor of liberty? Were they at all persuaded, did they expect, that their descendants would ever be participants in a scene such as we behold here to-night? [Confusion.] Is there power in Boston to maintain your laws? Can Boston do no better than this? Is it for Daniel Webster to stand up in Washington and say we are a law-abiding people? ['Three cheers for Webster.'] Is this what we are to call a law-abiding people, and is this an exhibition of obedience to law? [Laughter.]

I went this morning to Bunker Hill Monument, in order that I might refresh my recollection with some of the associations of 1775. [Groans.] And as I stood looking upon that monument, I remembered well the beginning of the oration which was delivered when that monument was consecrated, with the highest demonstrations of the nation's joy, a pillar to remind successive and remotest generations of the scenes that were once enacted there in the heart of liberty. When the orator stood at its base, and cast his eye up to the cap-stone, as if overwhelmed in its august presence, he exclaimed, 'There is the orator of the occasion.' And it was the orator of the occasion. Does this audience remember it? [Noise.] 'It looks,' he said, 'it speaks, it acts!' And did it not? And when I came into this hall to-night, I remembered those words of Webster. ['Three cheers for Webster—Three more.'] Cheer on, then, but let me ask, is this the liberty for which Washington fought and Warren fell? ['Three cheers for Washington—Three more—three more.'] I was only asking this audience, is this the liberty of speech for which those great men fought and fell? ['No!'] If Washington and Warren could face Great Britain, with its twenty millions, is Boston to be ruled in this manner? ['No!' 'Yes!'] If the patriots and heroes of that day could bid defiance to the British lion, and hold him at bay, have we so lost their spirit that a meeting in Faneuil Hall cannot quietly be held?

The Mob—'You insult our Senators'

Mr. Pillsbury—Who are your Senators, in God's name? ['Daniel Webster!' Six cheers.'] And fit to be *your* Senator? ['Yes!'] I was paying your Senator the highest compliment. I was calling to your remembrance his words at the consecration of Bunker Hill Monument. Shall I not be allowed to do that? Shall I not quote his words to this audience, when they are 'fit to be' quoted? Has it come to this, that in Faneuil Hall the words of one of the most eminent men of our country shall not be quoted, in compliment, even, to himself? I demand of you all to say what reproach has been cast upon any body's Senator here to-night. I was only telling you, ['Three cheers for Webster!'] that if the prominent——['Three more—Three cheers for the Constitution.'] I wish one of those officers of the police might come near enough that he might hear what I say, if nobody else does [Laughter.] [An officer advanced to the platform.] I was saying simply this: that when I came in to-night, and witnessed this cloud of human faces, every eye almost fixed in this direction, when I saw every part of this spacious hall crowded to its utmost capacity, I was reminded of the words uttered at the consecration of Bunker Hill Monument. [Mirth. 'Three cheers for Old Zack.'] And I thought, this mighty gathering is itself the orator of the evening.

What speech can be made here that shall tell on the South as does the presence of these gathered thousands? You would shout us down for attempting to utter that sentiment which I am pleased to have uttered in the hearing of at least *one* person who belongs to the City Government. And now I ask him, Is such a sentiment unworthy of Faneuil Hall? [Applause.] I think if I might not speak to the South, that this audience should. I thought it should go down to South Carolina to-morrow morning, on the telegraph, that five thousand people gathered in Faneuil Hall, to witness the closing scenes of the most important anniversary ever held in the city of Boston. And shall we not be able thus to convey our sentiments to the South? If we may not speak, may not these thousands tell their story, and bear their united testimony against the despotism that has governed us? ['Yes!'] I ask, where have the judgment and the reason of the people gone? ['Out!'] Only let us say by our presence to the South, that we have not forgotten the days of '76. But we are not able to *stand* quietly, much less to speak, in this temple of Freedom Let the South know that, and rejoice!

Tell me, ye who came here to-night not expecting to participate in any improper demonstration [laughter], has it come to this, that you are not permitted to bear your silent testimony in old Faneuil Hall? Are these thousands to be ruled in that matter by a handful of lawless desperadoes?—[Hisses.] May not the citizens of Boston stand here unmolested? [Hisses.]

Now, I ask all present, whether friends or foes, who have heard the sentiments that have been uttered to-night from this platform, what declaration has been made, what sentiment has been advanced, what question has been propounded, that ought not to have been uttered or propounded here? Did Wm. Lloyd Garrison express one solitary sentiment that was unworthy of this audience? ['Yes.'] Where is the man who will put his finger on one declaration that was uttered here which was not worthy of the occasion, the place, and more, of *the man*? and that is saying enough for you or any body else. [Applause.] What sentiment have I uttered here to-night which might not be recorded on the blue vault of heaven, and read by every intelligent being, from Maine to the Halls of the Montezumas? [Laughter from the enemy.] And yet, what have we beheld here to-night? I stand here to say that friend Garrison did not utter the sentiment (nor have I) that could not have been uttered in the city of Washington without a mob. ['Sit down.']

I know we have been charged with talking treason. But have we talked it to-night? I know we have been charged with opposing civil government. ['No.'] Have we opposed it here to-night? Civil government has been respected *on the platform*; can you say as much for it *off the platform*? ['Yes.' 'No.']

I should have been glad had the opportunity been allowed me, to have made some slight apology to you in behalf of our position as Disunionists, as we have been called; and I should have been glad to have asked the intelligent, the virtuous and the high-minded in this assembly to look for a moment at the reasons that have compelled us into the position we now occupy. It were not difficult to show, that if we are Disunionists, in the bad sense of the term, it is because we have reason to be; or, at any rate this is true; we are willing to submit the question to your better judgment, and to be convinced by you, if argument you have, that so we might co-operate with you in sustaining the government and in sustaining the Union. But we have somehow conceived the idea that there is not much union in our country at the present time. We have conceived the idea, that when Massachusetts cannot go to South Carolina, in the persons of our colored sailors or of our most eminent lawyers, that there is not *much* of union. How comes it, think you, that so much is said now, so much done to bolster up and to bind together the continually dissolving elements of which this so-called Union is composed. (Three cheers for the Union called for, but not given.]

If you had only indulged me quietly some few moments, I should have long since concluded what I had to say, and your ears would have been saluted with words more musical by far than mine. But I wished to do one thing. I have made an appeal to the greater portion of the audience, and I think it has not been in vain; for I think that there are but few here, but very few, who will not respond to every sentiment that has been uttered from this platform to-night. [Hisses.] I only want the authorities of Boston to know, that all we want is a candid hearing of our sentiments, and then, if there be nothing better than violence to meet us with, then we are content to be overwhelmed by violence. ['Never!' Cheers.] If violence can overwhelm us, we will consent to be overwhelmed. But I appeal to the sober men around me if argument is not better. [Uproar.] Is this a meeting where free speech is allowed? ['No.' 'Yes.'] Is this the place where it cannot be had? Is this your confession of that? [Hurrahs.] Then I am content.

Now, then, whatever shall be the result of the meeting *this evening*, I am quite sure of this: by far the most important anniversary ever held in the city of Boston is this that has been held the past three days; and, however violence may have been arrayed against it this evening, the sober second thought of the better portion of the people will sustain it, and [Noise and confusion] we shall have, in spite of that violence, a glorious immortality both in our triumph and reward.

Fugitive Slave Case.

The *Journal of Commerce* copies the following report of a recent trial from the *Indiana State Journal* of the 15th instant. Announcing it with a triumphant declaration of 'The Constitution and Laws Vindicated.' The decision, it will be seen, was based upon that in the Prigg case, which established the monstrous doctrine that Slave law is the paramount law all over the United States, that the slaveholder has, under the Constitution, the right to seize his fugitive slave wherever he can find him, and that he need not unless he choose, give any evidence that the man so seized is a slave, and if he does choose to give such evidence his own oath to the fact is sufficient. This is law in this Republic and it exceeds in its tyrannical spirit any claim ever yet set up in the worst of despotisms in any age, for it leaves utterly unprotected—so far as the law is concerned—the personal liberty of the citizen, and the unknown and the humble may, at any time, no matter what the hue of their complexion, be claimed as slaves, and reduced without the hope or possibility of redemption to the condition of slaves for life. It is this state of things for which the *Journal of Commerce* is striving, and for which Mr. Websters 'retainers' all over the country are thanking him for aiding to produce:

IMPORTANT DECISION.—The suit of John Norris, of Broome county, Kentucky, *vs.* Leander B. Newton, E. B. Crocker, and seven others, for the recovery of damages for aiding and abetting the escape of slaves, after more than a week's investigation before the circuit court of the United States, was determined on Wednesday last in favor of the plaintiff. A verdict of TWO THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX DOLLARS was given by the jury against the defendants as the value of the slaves and other damages.

The suit has elicited considerable interest, and was decided mainly under a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Prigg, where the court takes the ground that the owner of a slave has the right, under the constitution and act of Congress, to capture his property in a free State, and take it thence without going before a State court and obtaining a certificate.

On this trial it was proved that four negroes claimed by Norris, were captured in the State of Michigan. They had absconded from their master, in Boone county, Kentucky, in October, 1846. That he immediately, on the next morning after their escape, went in pursuit of them. He proved by two or three witnesses that he was their owner, and had been for a number of years. After searching for his negroes between one and two months, he abandoned the pursuit. He traced them as far as Laurel, in Franklin county, but could then obtain no further information as to the route they had taken. Last fall he received information that they had fled to Michigan, and settled in a neighborhood in Cass county, where it is estimated by witnesses that about one thousand negroes reside. He took some five or six persons with him, and, in the night, captured his negroes in Michigan, and immediately proceeded on his journey homeward to Kentucky. After passing through South Bend, and at a distance of a mile and a half from the town, Norris and his party stopped on the roadside for refreshments. While there a party came from South Bend, accompanied by the deputy sheriff of the county, and made an arrest, under a writ of habeas corpus. Norris and his party returned with the negroes to South Bend, and a trial was had before the judge of the probate court of St. Joseph county Norris made a return on the writ of habeas corpus, under oath, stating that the negroes were his property, and that he was taking them to his residence in Boone county, whence they had escaped. The truth of this return was admitted by Crocker, who appeared in behalf of the negroes, but who filed a demurrer, claiming the liberation of the slaves, on the ground that they had been captured in Michigan, and there was no certificate of the right of ownership having been proven in that State. The judge, deciding that this was necessary, liberated the negroes. Norris, anticipating this decision, had procured a writ to take the negroes, from the clerk of the circuit court, and as soon as the decision was pronounced, attempted to take them, when a scene of great confusion ensued. The Kentucky party were armed with pistols and bowie-knives, and the crowd with canes and clubs. After considerable excitement, the negroes were taken to the jail of the county, by the sheriff for safe keeping.

Several criminal suits were then instituted against the Kentucky party, which, it was alledged by the plaintiff's counsel, were for the purpose of aiding in the ultimate rescue of the negroes. The negroes were demanded of the Sheriff by Norris; but he was refused possession, as, in the mean time, a second writ of *habeas corpus* had been issued, on which the negroes were, in the end, discharged, Norris not appearing on the second trial. The first trial was had on Friday afternoon, and the negroes were finally liberated on the next Monday morning. During the time intervening it was in evidence that from seventy-five to two hundred negroes, from Michigan were present in South Bend, armed with guns and clubs, and a number of them finally escorted the negroes out of town, when they were discharged.

Judge McLean, in giving his charge to the jury, said that the decision of the judge on the first trial, on the writ of *habeas corpus*, was incorrect, under a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case above referred to; that the writ of *habeas corpus* was proper, and was at all times allowable; but the question under it in this case was the right of ownership. That being admitted, the slaves should have been remanded into the custody of Norris. The judge said he had dissented from this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States when it was given; but he was now bound to carry it out. On the part of the defence, a plea was set up that Norris had given his negroes liberty to come across the river at the time of their escape; but this was not proven to the satisfaction of the jury. Had this been the case, Norris could not have had the advantage of the act of Congress and the decision of the Supreme Court in their capture.

Messrs. Linton and Smith acquitted themselves with much credit on the part of the plaintiff, and Messrs. Jernegan and Marshall made a most able defence. Mr. Smith spoke between six and seven hours in the closing speech.

Under this decision we can see no reasons why the citizens of the South should complain of injustice being done them while in pursuit of their fugitive slaves, at least so far as Indiana is concerned. The law, as it exists, will soon be understood, under a few more decisions like the present, and all future difficulty will be avoided. We have no doubt that much of the excitement was occasioned, on the part of many of the citizens of South Bend, in consequence of either misapprehending the true nature of the case, or the law under which they were acting. All citizens, according to the decision of the judge, are bound to know the law, and great pains will hereafter no doubt be taken not to become involved in difficulties like the present. The cost of the present suit, in addition to the damages awarded, will be very great.

A motion has been made by the defendants' counsel for a new trial and an arrest of judgment.

A Baltimore correspondent of the *Tribune* writes as follows:

A trial of Capt. William K. Gardiner, master of the brig Frances Jane, and William Humphries, first mate of the same vessel, for the manslaughter of William Thomas, the colored cook of the brig, is now progressing in the United States District Court before Judge Heath. The vessel sailed from Baltimore for Porto Rico on the 21st of February last, and the cook being drunk the first day, the captain and mate beat him most dreadfully, following up the same treatment until the morning of the 24th, when they beat him for full one hour, made him eat raw potato parings and refuse meat, and drink salt water with it, causing his death in half an hour afterward. The testimony of the witnesses for the prosecution on Tuesday and yesterday, details one of the most revolting and inhuman murders I have ever listened to. The result can scarcely be doubted, many expressing their decided disapprobation that an indictment for murder was not found. Ex-Attorney General John Nelson and Messrs. Pitts and Campbell, the ablest counsel in the city, are employed in the defence.

It is some satisfaction to know that these men have since been convicted of manslaughter. But would they, with so small provocation, have ever thought or dared of so cruelly and brutally maltreating a white man? Horrible murders are not uncommon, but it is rare that some motive cannot be assigned for them. For this none can be assigned except that the poor victim of the inhumanity of these wretches was black. The correspondent of the *Tribune* in the same letter from which we copy the above paragraph, adds at the close the following item of intelligence in which may be found precisely the same spirit as that which murdered so wantonly and cruelly the cook of the "Frances Jane." The spirit of Colonization is the spirit of hatred, and contempt, and cruelty towards the negro:

The bark Liberia Packet, the regular trader between this port and Monrovia, Africa, owned by the State Colonization Society and citizens of Liberia, I learn will take out a very large number of emigrants on her next voyage of the first of July. It is said to be doubtful whether she can accommodate all who wish to go. The liberality of the New York Colonization Society in giving $3,000—one-half toward the expenses of the expedition of the 1st July, and the other half to the purchase of the great resort of slave dealers, the Gallinos River and territory—has infused new vigor into the Maryland Society, which is making great exertions to send out all the applicants.

Domestic Correspondence.

LETTER TO PROFESSOR STUART.

WILLIAMSBURGH, June 18, 1850.

Rev. MOSES STUART, Andover:

SIR—It seems that a pamphlet has recently been published in your name, on the subject of the rendition of fugitive slaves, as required by the United States Constitution.

I have not seen this pamphlet. But in the *New York Express* of 5th inst., I find what purports to be, and I presume is, an extract from it of some length. And presuming, from the appearance of it, that the pith and marrow of your argument are to be found in this extract, I take the liberty of making it the foundation of some observations.

You do not leave us long in doubt as to the side you have chosen in the great controversy of Freedom against Slavery. We find it on the very threshhold of your argument,—in your motto, taken from 1 Corinthians, 7. 21, *one half* of the sentence you have taken reads thus: "Art thou called being a servant? care not for it." This as suiting your purpose, thus torn from its context you have taken for your motto, and it defines your position. The rest of the sentence which is weighty and significant against you, is dropped altogether. "*But if thou* MAYEST BE MADE FREE, CHOOSE IT RATHER." This sort of quotation may be very fair at Andover; but whether it will be so held, in the old fashioned schools of logic and ethics, may well be doubted.

Like Napoleon in his last campaign, you have certainly taken us by surprise. To-day, we do not even suspect you in our vicinity: at midnight, aroused by the first blast of your trumpet, (your motto) we find you in our midst, (unhappy Abolitionists that we are!) cutting and slashing, and riding over us rough-shod, in your haste to be at "Brussels." What *gifted* intellect may inflict "Waterloo" upon you, in your progress, I know not, and must be content to endeavor to sustain, as I best may, the more painful and less glorious conflict of Quatre Bras. And though I may not hope like David to *slay* this uncircumcised Philistine,—your argument—yet, with the simple sling and stone of my vernacular, and a deep feeling of right on my side, I trust, with the Divine Blessing on my efforts, materially to damage it.

You begin with the anti-rendition text, Deut. 23. 15, 16. "Thou shalt *not* deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates; where it liketh him best. Thou shalt not oppress him." This you announce, exathedra, applies *only* to a *foreign* fugitive slave, escaping from a *foreign* country and a *foreign master*, "to thee," i. e. "Israel." "If he had been a Hebrew servant the whole face of the thing would have been changed. Restoration, or restitution, if we may judge from the tenor of the other property laws among the Hebrews, would surely have been enjoined." Before I proceed further, I beg to be permitted to make a few enquiries.

Does it not occur to you that all this is a merely gratuitous assumption on your part of the whole matter in issue? What proof do you offer? On what circumstance do you rely? You refer to the language. I am assured by Hebraists that "Thee" and "Thou" are in the original in the same forms precisely as in the *Ten* Commandments, and *there* it is universally conceded that they apply both to the people collectively and to each individual specially. We Abolitionists are a stiff-necked people, Sir, and require much stronger proof than we think it is in your power to adduce to satisfy *us*, that terms in general so comprehensive are in this instance employed only in reference to the Hebrew *nation* on the one hand, and to the fugitive immigrant on the other.

As to the "Restoration" or "restitution" on which, from analogy, you seem to rely "*would* surely have been enjoined," had the text beeen intended for a Hebrew servant (or servant of a Hebrew,) I have this to say, that from the absence of such injunction, if this text has no relation to this important point, I draw an inference fatal to your interpretation. Incidentally throughout the LAW, are mingled commands, enunciated with considerable particularity, in relation to *wrongs* on *other* property, and the modes and manner in which those wrongs should be righted. There can be no doubt or question between us in the matter of stealing or injuring an ox or an ass; or about strays; or the burning of a neighbor's standing corn, &c. &c. In all these instances the command is clear enough to preclude dispute. But admit, for an instant only, that your interpretation is the true one, and then how do you account for the total absence of all Law, or Rule, or direction, in the most important matter of *property* which *could* arise in the Jewish community, namely, the matter of Runaway servants?

The Hebrews appear to have derived or obtained servants from three different sources; from amongst themselves; from strangers born in the land, and from the heathen nations round about them. I can have no doubt that in the treatment of the first class of servants, and the two last, there was a difference—of what nature it is aside from my present purpose to enquire. But amongst them all were there no fugitives? No runaways from their Hebrew masters? That is incredible. For even among ourselves there are runaway *apprentices*. Take away the text in Deuteronomy, and I think it will appear, even to you, as something strange and anomalous, that in the entire Law there is nothing else to govern this most important point in the Jewish Polity, so far as any question of *property* is involved. Without the light of *that* text the Hebrews, like ourselves, must have been forever groping in midnight darkness and confusion. With it, they had light, not merely as of the sun, to direct them, but of Him who *created* that luminary.

For observe. Sir, what, I must think, would be the effect of the restoration of this beneficent law to our *own codes*, from which it was finally torn by the impious clause in the United States Constitution. Restored, the master would reason, "if I do not treat my my servant well he will runaway, and if he does, I shall not again recover him." Concession, doubtless the smallest possible for the purpose of retention, *would* be made. Gradually, however, still further concessions would be found necessary for the same purpose, until the master would find Slavery more intolerable to *him* than to his *slave*. He would say, "take your freedom, and for your labor, if I want it,"—as he doubtless would—"I will pay you wages." Would not this have been its operation among ourselves but for the detestable clause in the Constitution of *our* confederacy? Was not probably such its operation among the Jews? How else can we account for the *total* yet plainly *undesigned* silence of Jewish history on a point which, among *us*, threatens to dissolve the Union of *these* States, but among *them* had grown into too little importance to attract notice, or to furnish even the smallest item of their history?

Other avocations call me away, and I must, for the present, conclude. Respectfully,

P. SHAPTER.

General Intelligence.

TERRIBLE DISASTER ON LAKE ERIE.—One of those terrible events which are so common on our inland waters, and which occur nowhere else in the world but the United States, happened last week on Lake Erie. From some unknown cause the steamer Griffith took fire, and in a few moments was enveloped in flames. She was run into seven feet water, but the larger portion of her passengers were either burned to death or drowned. The *Buffalo Express* furnishes some particulars as follows:

The Griffith was a new boat of medium dimensions, and of excellent character with the travelling public. She had just been purchased by Capt. Roby, a worthy officer, who had entered in command of her. This, we think, was his first trip, and it has proved of dreadful fatality to himself and an interesting family, all of whom fell victims to the fire or flood.

Up to 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon we could obtain no further particulars, except that the propeller Delaware had been to the wreck, and that the probable loss of life would reach *two hundred and sixty*.

Mr. Franklin Heth, formerly of this city, was on board with his family. His brother, Mr James Heth, of this city, last evening received a telegraphic dispatch from him, dated Ashtabula, Ohio, from which we make the following extract:

"My wife and four children are drowned! Will be in Buffalo to-morrow morning by the Troy. Have the bodies with me."

The boat was insured in this city for $27,775, as follows:

In the Astor Co. New York, $6,000; North Western, $6,000; Buffalo Mutual, $6,000; Buffalo Merchants Mutual, $5,000; Lexington, $2,500; Columbus, $2,275. *By O'Reilly's Line.*]

ASHTABULA, June 17—9 P. M.

By C. Spencer, of Ashtabula, who was a passenger on the Griffith, we learn the following:

I saved myself by swimming ashore. There were 300 passengers on board, and out of that number 50 only were saved. The steamer was about three fourths of a mile from shore when she was abandoned, and 15 miles east of Cleaveland. The fire was supposed to have originated from the boilers or the furnace.

The passengers were thick around the boat, and a great many that could not swim would hold on to others and drown them as well as themselves. It was a sorrowful and heart-rending scene. The manner in which I got out of their way was by jumping about twenty feet into the water, and took directly out into the lake and then swam up a little distance to get out of the reach of others and to prevent them pulling me down. I then swam for the shore.

There were about 5,000 people on shore when I reached it, from Cleveland Willoughby, Painesville, and Fairport.

ERIE, 10 o'clock, P. M.—Steamboat Troy just in, and we are indebted to Mr. Forsyth, the Clerk for the following additional particulars:

Lost—Capt. Roby, wife and daughter; Michael Juno, 3d Engineer; Mr. Mann, wheelsman; Traley, 1st Por

Miscellany.

From the Home Journal.

POST-MORTUUM SOIREE.

Not being entirely persuaded, as yet, of our own omniscience, we are unwilling to decline knowing anything more; and we, therefore, accepted an invitation, lately, to pass an evening with the "Knockers." The inducement was somewhat strengthened by the possibility that spirits have preferences as to the society they are expected to meet—for the party was small, and would be considered select, we should suppose, in any world populated principally from this. We venture to name the gentleman, as it is something, when spirits knock, (with or without bodies,) to know whom they are knocking for; and we shall not hear, till we are beyond "affidavits," whether there was anything compromising in the uncertain portion of the company. Our host was Rev. Rufus W. Griswold, and, present, were Fenimore Cooper, Rev. Dr. Hawks, Mr. Bryant, Mr. Bancroft, Gen. Lyman, Tuckerman the Essayist, Dr. Francis, Dr. Marcy, Mr. Bigelow, of the *Evening Post*, Mr. Ripley, of the *Tribune*, and one or two others.

On our way in, we saw the "Knocking Party," of four ladies, looking for the house—into which, (it is, perhaps essential to state,) they had never before entered, and the floors and walls of which they had had no opportunity, of course, to cram with accomplices and hammers. A stout lady, of the ordinary small-town type of maternity, led the way, followed by three young ladies considerably prettier than the average. The eldest of these, Mrs. Fish, is a widow, perhaps twenty-five years of age, and she is the spokeswoman of the knocking spirits; though we are a little surprised, precedent and all things considered, that one of the virgins was not elected for that office. The two Misses Fox, as well as their married sister, have nerves so plumply clad in health and tranquility, that it is difficult to reconcile their appearance with the fact that they have been worked upon, for two years, by the phenomena of unexplained visitations; and, indeed, throughout the evening, we were struck with their combined good-humor and simplicity, and the ease and unpretendingness with which they let their visitors (from both worlds) have their own way. They evidently won the respect and liking of all present, as the evening went on.

[We had written the above when the *Tribune* was handed in, containing a carefully prepared and most correct account of the spirit interviews. We will first copy it thus making more sure of leaving nothing untold, and will afterwards add what little else we chanced personally to observe.]

"For some time, perhaps a little over half an hour after the arrival of the ladies, no sounds were heard, and the company gave obvious symptoms of impatience. They were then requested to draw nearer the table, which was in front of the ladies and form themselves into a compact circle. Soon after, faint sounds began to be heard from under the floor, around the table and in different parts of the room. They increased in loudness and frequency, becoming so clear and distinct that no one could deny their presence, nor trace them to any visible cause. The question was now asked by the ghost-seers, "will the spirits converse with any one present?" No satisfactory answer was obtained, though there was a general rumbling succession of sounds, the purport of which appeared to be ambiguous, to those who professed to be the most conversant with the language. The question was then put more definitely, with regard to several gentlemen present. After a good deal of coquetting, it is said that replies would be given to any questions proposed by Dr. Marcy. He inquired whether the spirit which he wished to converse with was a relation—was a child—and what was its age at the time of its death. We understood Dr. Marcy to say that the answers were correct, but nothing worthy of special notice was elicited.

"Mr. Henry T. Tuckerman was the next to propound inquiries, which, contrary to the usual custom, he expressed audibly, so as to be heard by the ladies and the whole company. Having fixed in his mind the name of an individual, he asked, 'Did he live in New York?' No answer. 'In Baltimore? In Cambridge? In Boston?'—three distinct raps, which is the sign of an affirmative answer. A negative reply is indicated by silence. Mr. T. continued, 'Was he a lawyer? A merchant? A physician? A clergyman? Knocks. 'Was he an Episcopalian? A Presbyterian? A Unitarian?'—going over the names of the principal sects. No answer. At the suggestion of a gentleman, Mr. T. asked 'Was he a Christian?' Knocks Mr. T. then asked the age of the person in a series of tens. 'Was he twenty years old at the time of his death? Was he thirty? Fifty? Sixty?' Knocks. 'Has he left a family?' Knocks. 'Children?' Knocks 'Five? Three? Two?' Knocks. 'Did he die in Boston? In Philadelphia? In Albany? In Northampton? In Bennington?' Knocks. 'Did he die of consumption? Of fever? Of cholera? Of old age?' Knocks.

"The person in Mr. Tuckerman's mind was the late Rev. Dr. Channing of Boston, who died in Bennington, Vt., while on a journey. The degree of correctness in the answers may be judged by the readers. It may be stated, however, that for the last years of his life Dr C. disclaimed the use of all sectarian names, preferring to be called only Christian, and that, though under seventy, his physical powers had long suffered from premature exhaustion.

"Rev. Dr. Hawks was then urgently solicited by several of the party to propose inquiries, to which, after some hesitation, he reluctantly consented. He did not meet with any great success. The sounds uttered were faint, almost inaudible at several times, and in the great majority of cases indicated an incorrect reply. Dr. Hawks pursued his inquiries with exemplary patience, but, after several more ineffectual attempts, he resigned the floor to Dr. John W. Francis, who was welcomed with a general roll of knockings, from the mysterious agents, seeming to claim the privilege of old and intimate acquaintance. With his proverbial urbanity, seating himself as if at the bedside of a patient, Dr. F. asked in terms of the most insinuating blandness, whether the spirits present would converse with any member of the company? Would they vouchsafe to speak to his illustrious friend, the world-renowned author, Mr. Cooper? Would they converse with the great American poet, Mr. Bryant? To these flattering invitations no reply was given. Would they speak to so humble an individual as himself? Loud knocks. Dr. F. then asked, fixing on a person; Was he an American? Was he an Englishman? Was he a Scotchman? The knocks were loud and unanimous. Was he a merchant? Was he a lawyer? Was he an author? Loud knocks. Was he a poet? Yes, in distinct knocks. Will you tell his name? Here the spirits called for the alphabet, by sounds intelligible to the ghost-seers. The answers by this method are given in knocks at the letter desired when the alphabet is repeated by one of the ladies. It then spelled out B-u-r—when the company indiscreetly, but spontaneously, interrupted, by crying out Robert Burns. This was the true answer, and after the interview with the favorite Scotch poet, Dr. F. declined any further communication.

"Mr. J. Fennimore Cooper was then requested to enter into the supra-mundane sphere, and proceeded to interrogate the spirits, with the most imperturbable self-possession and deliberation. After several desultory questions, from which no satisfactory answers were obtained, Mr. C commenced a new series of inquiries. Is the person I inquire about a relative? Yes, was at once indicated by the knocks. A near relative? Yes. A man? No answer. A woman? Yes. A daughter? A mother? A wife? No answer. A sister? Yes. Mr. C. then asked the number of years since her death. To this the answer was given in rapid and indistinct raps, some counting forty-five, others forty-nine, fifty-four, etc. After considerable parleying, as to the manner in which the question should be answered, the consent of the invisible interlocutor was given to knock the years so slowly that they might be distinctly counted. This was done. Knock—knock—knock—for what seemed over a minute, till the number amounted to fifty, and was unanimously announced by the company. Mr. C. now asked, Did she die of consumption?—naming several diseases to which no answer was given. Did she die by accident? Yes. Was she killed by lightning? Was she shot? Was she lost at sea? Did she fall from a carriage? Was she thrown from a horse? Yes.

"Mr. Cooper did not pursue his inquiries any further, and stated to the company that the answers were correct, the person alluded to by him being a sister, who, just fifty years ago the present month, was killed by being thrown from a horse.

"The evening was now far advanced, and it was not thought desirable to continue the colloquies any further. At the suggestion of several gentlemen, the ladies removed from the sofa, where they had sat during the evening, and remained standing in another part of the room. The knockings were now heard on the doors, at both ends of the room, producing a vibration on the panels, which was felt by every one who touched them. Different gentlemen stood on the outside and the inside of the door at the same time, when loud knockings were heard on the side opposite to that where they stood. The ladies were at such a distance from the door in both cases, as to lend no countenance to the idea that the sounds were produced by any direct communication with them. They now went into a parlor, under the room in which the party was held, accompanied by several gentlemen, and the sounds were then produced with great distinctness, causing sensible vibrations in the sofa, and apparently coming from a thick hearth-rug before the fire-place, as well as from other quarters of the room."

We could not but be struck with the disinclination which these spirits seem to have for any intercourse with editors. A modified assent by knockings, more or less strong, was given to every other proposal. When asked by Mrs. Fish, "would the spirits converse with Dr. Francis?" the knocking was so loud and immediate as to create a general laugh. The urbane Doctor was so evidently a favorite in the nether world, that it suggested a query in our own mind, whether politeness may not go farther even than we suppose. The knocking next loudest was the assent given to an interview with Dr. Hawks. To Mr. Cooper there was apparently no objection, though the assent was not very cordial, but he seemed to improve on acquaintance, for, to no one, were the spirits half so willing to repeat their revelations twice over or half so explicit. To Mr. Tuckerman and Dr. Marcy, they were moderately gracious and communicative. The company, however, (probably with an eye to the improvement given to a description, by the "*pars magna fui*,") insisted on direct applications for interviews with the members of the Press. "Would the Spirits converse with Mr. Ripley of the Tribune?" No answer. "Would the Spirits converse with Mr Bryant?" No answer. "Would the Spirits converse with Mr. Willis?" No answer. The last two refusals surprised us somewhat, for we had supposed that the world of imagination was between this and the Spirit-land—half-way to whence these knockers come, that is to say—and we expected that Mr. Bryant and ourself, as men who had done business in that intermediate world, would have been looked upon as neighbors. Either our trans-Styx ic geography is wrong—or ghosts have no taste for poets—or newspaper Editors (and this we could believe with very little more evidence) have no immediate connection with Elysium. If we had been alone, in our "dead cut," by the way, we might have thought it a resentment for our neglect of a previous invitation; for we had received the following pokerish note, a few days before, and in the multiplicity of engagements, had forgotten to attend to it:

"Mrs. Fox and her daughters, having received communications from the Spiritual world, would be happy to see Mr. Willis at Barnum's Hotel, at any hour most convenient to himself."

What a whirl we live in (let us remark here, as gravely as you please!) when even the offer of immediate news from another world can be thrown aside among neglected invitations!

One little peculiarity, hitherto unremarked, came to our notice. The questioner's seat, to give him access to paper and pencil, was on one side of the table, and, chancing to occupy the place between him and the ladies, we had accidentally thrown our arm over the back of his chair. Whenenever the knockings occurred, we observed that his chair was shaken, though our own intermediate chair, and the two standing immediately behind, were unmoved. We called attention to it, and it was corroborated by the other gentlemen. With such heavy weight in the chair as Mr. Cooper's, or Dr. Francis's, it would have taken a blow with a heavy hammer to have produced so much of a vibration. That spirits can exercise mechanical force at all, is something new to believe. And the law of mechanics would be equally puzzled (cavillers insisting that the ladies themselves produce these noises and vibrations) to explain how Mr. Cooper's chair was shaken, when we aver, that, between their petticoats and him, we sat unmoved, positively cutting off all physical and mortal communication. We may add that the ladies gave no particular attention to the phenomena, talking willingly to any one while the knockings were going on. Later in the evening, it was proposed to the Spirits to let us see them move the table across the room—a feat they are said to have done—but they were not in the humor.

An experiment was tried as to what the Invisibles would do with one of the ladies alone, or with two without the third, or with a gentleman, and one or two of the ladies. The strongest knockings were on the floor beneath, when the widow and her two sisters stood anywhere together. With two of them the knocks were fainter. We placed ourself between the widow and one of the young ladies, and the Spirits would have nothing to say to them in our company. To one of the virgins, or to the widow singly, there was no demonstration. The spell, evidently, is in the combination and close locality of these three. Yet it seems communicable, with neighborhood and time. Mrs. Fish mentioned that, in Rochester, the knocking visitaiton *had spread*, extending at present, to twenty or thirty families. If it is to "spread" the world over, and if we are all to have spirits at our command, *such as are already proved to be able to shake chairs and move tables*, there will soon come a Fulton or a Morse, who will put this ghost-power into harness, and it will follow Steam and Electricity in doing man's work for him. Things really look like a removal of *man's* curse at the Fall, labor; and, if chloroform do as much for *woman's* curse, so that she will no longer "bring forth in sorrow," we do not see much hindrance in the way of an early Millenium. It would be wise, we fancy, pretty soon, to wash our hands and take a holiday a little oftener, that "all play and no work" may not prove rather tedious than otherwise, when it comes, after all!

With three men on the outside of a door and three on the inside, watching it closely, that door could not be so violenily knocked upon as to tremble, though no visible force approached it, without giving one something to believe We witnessed this, with one hand upon the panels, and what can it be, but the exercise of a power beyond anything of which we have hitherto known the laws? That it is to be subject to human control seems probable, for it acts, at present, in a certain obedience to human orders, and is most obedient to those who have used it longest. There seems an alphabet to learn, in this as in other new fields of knowledge; and, indeed,—considering the confusion of ideas in the minds of those who visit and try to talk, off-hand, with these newly discovered "natives,"—it is wonderful that the Knockers make themselves as well understood as they already do. If Providence design to subject an *intelligent* power to our service—(in addition to the *unintelligent* miracle-workers, Steam and Electricity, which have successfully been given us)—the beginnings would, by all precedent, be at least as imperfect and dimly understood as these are.

The suggestions and "outside" bearings of this matter are many and curious. If these knocking answers to questions are made, (as many insist) by *electric detonations* and if disembodied spirits are still moving consciously, among us, and have thus *found an agent, at last*, ELECTRICITY, *by which they can communicate with the world they have left*, it must soon, in the progressive nature of things, ripen to an intercourse between this and the spirit-world. The failure of the "Cincinnatians" to establish their "clairvoyant telegraph," three or four years ago, may have been owing to the fact that the new power is an intelligence, and will not be basely employed to "fetch and carry" for trade. But we understand it has consented to be employed for healing. A report was made to the Homœopathic college, of New York, recently, that a physician had employed these Knockers to consult the Spirit of Hahnemann as to a case despaired of, and the instructions given in the reply had been followed, *to the cure of the patient*. The "Knocking" differs from clairvoyance, in the fact, that the Spirit, in the former case, *speaks first*—and it is an advance upon clairvoyance, of course, as Spirits know where they can be of use, better than we, and are more at leisure to knock and tell us, than we to look up a clairvoyant. But then comes the wonder, how those, who have got well out of this world, should either wish or consent to have anything more to do with it! Or is it as schoolmasters go back to mix with children for their good, or as missionaries fall behind, in the march of civilization, to carry light to the benighted heathen who are coming on rather too slowly?

We were very glad to see Mr. Cooper interested in the "Knockers," the other evening, for he is one of the few men not afraid of the world, and whatever he sees and believes, with his logical and bold mind, he has the courage to tell, and tell well. The numerous places in which these Knockings have been heard, within the past year, show that the ghosts at large have got the trick of it, and the "demonstration," altogether, to our thinking, is of sufficient extent and respectability to warrant grave attention. An electric telegraph across the Styx, before they get one across the Atlantic, would make death less of a separation from friends than a voyage to Europe—but there is no end to the speculation on the subject, and we leave it with our readers.

N. P. W.

INTOLERANCE:

ITS CAUSE AND CURE.

About two years ago, I applied to the Leeds and Yorkshire Insurance Company to get my property insured. As soon as the Directors found that I was Joseph Barker, the heretic and democrat, they rejected my application. They insured my brother Benjamin's property without hesitation. He was as ultra in his political and religious principles as myself, but he did not exert himself so much, to propagate his views by lecturing and writing. I was not only a heretic and a democrat, but a *teacher* and *preacher* of heresy and democracy. The Leeds and Yorkshire Insurance Office could not therefore *think* of insuring *my* property. I might be a sober and an honest man; a prudent and a prosperous tradesman. No matter: The Leeds and Yorkshire Insurance Company considered it necessary, to show that they strongly disapproved of my views and proceedings, by refusing to have anything to do with me. It is very probable that the Leeds and Yorkshire Insurance Company insure the property of men who hold more ultra views than myself: and it is certain that they insure the property of drunkards, fornicators, adulterers, and commercial thieves. But what are drunkards, fornicators, adulterers or commercial thieves, compared with a man who endeavors to enlighten the people on religious and political subjects—who wishes to emancipate the masses from priestly and aristocratic thraldom—who endeavors to bring the great body of the people to judge for themselves what is true and right, and to act according to their judgments, without regard either to the dictates of priests, or to the wishes of tyrants? Nay, what is the vilest wretch on earth, provided he be of an easy disposition and a quiet way of life, compared with a man who, though he teaches people to love and honor God, and to live for the welfare of each other, yet speaks and acts in such a way as is calculated to make people, who have so long been the pliant tools of priests and tyrants, and the blind supporters of superstition and kingcraft, into thinking, rational, virtuous and independent men.

The Leeds and Yorkshire Insurance Company must show that they abhor a man who tries to raise the masses to freedom and independence, above all other men. They must show, that though they can insure the property of drunkards, fornicators, adulterers, and thieves, they must not insure the property of a man who would increase the influence and power of the working classes, by making them wiser and better men.

At first, I supposed that the Leeds and Yorkshire Insurance Company would stand alone in this respect. I afterwards, however, found that they did not. I thought it my duty, before starting to America, to try again to get my property insured. I accordingly applied to a company for that purpose. The company declined. A friend of mine promised to apply to one or two other companies for me. He did so; but to no purpose. Not a company could be found that would insure my property. They did not object to the *amount* for which I wished to insure it. They all objected, so far as I could learn, on the broad principle, that they ought not to encourage a man who was a heretic in religion, and a democrat in politics, and who made it his study and endeavor to spread his latitudinarian opinions and his republican principles among his countrymen.

Well; I am not aware that i have lost anything by the bigotry or intolerance of those insurance companies. My property has taken no harm; and I have saved the money that I must have paid for its insurance, if I had not been so very unpopular with our orthodox religionists and middle-class politicians. But it looks rather strange, that in England, in the middle of the nineteenth century, a peaceful, sober, steady man, and a prosperous, if not a prudent, tradesman—a man who has generally had a tolerable reputation, even amongst his enemies for good sense—should be unable to get his property insured. It looks rather strange, that in England, in the middle of the nineteenth century, a man of this description, should be treated by public companies in the way in which I have the honor to be treated.

At one of the Leeds Education Meetings I stated, that a schoolmaster of Leeds had objected to take a young man into his school as a scholar, because he was the son of the NOTORIOUS Joseph Barker. I afterwards heard that one person thought such a thing hardly possible. I shall not be surprised if some think what I am *now* stating hardly possible. They will think it too late for such intolerance in such a country as England.

I feel no uneasiness on this account; much less do I feel any malice towards the directors of those insurance companies. I am as happy with my property uninsured, for anything I know, as I should be with it *insured*. When I applied for its insurance, it was not to please myself, but to please my family and friends; and now, having made application for insurance without success,—having done what I could to meet the views of my family and friends, I feel as much at ease, as if my property were insured for twice its value. Still, I think it well to name those matters, that my friends may know,—and that the coming generation may know, if the coming generation should ever interest themselves in such affairs,—how a heretic and a democrat, how a latitudinarian in theology, and a republican in politics, was regarded and treated in the Borough of Leeds, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, in the Kingdom of Great Britain, in the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-nine.

To-day, May 13, one thousand, eight hundred and fifty, I applied for the large room in the Exchange Buildings, Leeds. I wished to deliver some lectures in it in reply to Mr. Williams, the Methodist preacher, who made his furious attack on me at the public Education meeting, at Leeds, on the 16th of April last. Mr. Smith, the person who generally lets the room, told me, that if they agreed to *let* me the room, it would be £2 a night; but he added, that the committee were rather particular as to the *objects* for which they let it. I told him that *my* object was to reply to certain remarks made by Mr. Williams, the Methodist preacher, at the Education Meeting, in the Cloth Hall Yard,—that there was to have been a public discussion between Mr. Williams and me, but that Mr. Williams had refused to keep his engagement; and that that was the reason I wished to deliver some lectures on the subject. He said there was a difference of opinion amongst the members of the committee; but that they were unwilling to let the room for anything that would be likely to injure the interests of morality. I said that *my* lectures *would* be likely to injure the interests of morality in the opinion of *some* but that in the opinion of others they would be just the contrary. I told him I had no desire that the room should be let to me under any misconception,—that the *particular* object of my lectures would be to prove,—first, that the doctrines of Methodism are not scriptural, and secondly, that the scriptures themselves are not a perfect standard of truth and duty. He said if I would stay a moment, he would lay the matter before the committee. He did so; and then came back and informed me, that the committee declined letting me the room for that object.

As I have said, I mention those matters, not because they affect my individual interests, but because I wish my readers to understand how a man of liberal sentiments in theology and politics is regarded by orthodox sectarians and middle class politicians. As I have intimated, I attribute this intolerance in our public companies, partly, to a dislike of popular liberty and independence. It may also be partly attributed to a regard to their own reputation and profit. Many people refuse to patronise public bodies, that show a disposition to accommodate heretics, infidels, or republicans. But I am far from thinking that these are the *only* causes of the intolerance which I have been describing. In some, this intolerance is to be attributed to their erroneous views. They hold certain opinions which cause them to look on such intolerance as a duty.

Their intolerance is the natural result of modern orthodoxy. They believe, for instance, that the interests of morality, and the eternal welfare of men's souls, depend on their belief in the doctrines of the trinity, satisfaction to justice, natural depravity, justification and salvation by faith alone, eternal torments, and scripture infallibility. They therefore believe that any one who speaks or writes in such a way as to shake men's *belief* in those doctrines, is undermining morality, and ruining men's souls. They therefore consider themselves bound in duty to God,—they consider themselves bound by a regard to the highest interests of mankind, they consider themselves bound by their love to Jesus,—they consider themselves bound by the strongest and most solemn obligations imaginable, to oppose those who speak and act in such a way as is calculated to bring men to regard such doctrines as foolish and false. They consider themselves bound to make it as difficult as possible for such men to gain access to the public ear or to the public eye. Their religious belief, their theological principles, *require* them to do so. If their belief were true, intolerance would not only be *excusable*, but *praiseworthy*. Those who believe the leading principles of orthodox theology, are bound in conscience to do all that they lawfully can,—to do all that is not, in their judgment, expressly forbidden by Jesus or by God, to prevent such persons as myself from obtaining any opportunities whatever of publishing or spreading our views.

Some have complained that orthodox employers have sometimes turned away work-people because they held what they considered erroneous or heretical opinions. But those orthodox employers did no more than what they were bound by their *belief* to do. They could not have continued those erroneous or heretical men in their employ without violating their principles; without acting contrary to what all who hold such principles, must believe to be their duty to God and to men's souls. Every orthodox employer considers himself bound to do what he can to promote the spiritual welfare, the eternal salvation, of the souls of his work-people. He also believes, that it is impossible for his work-people to be saved,—that it is impossible for them to obtain the favor of God and the blessings of eternal life, unless they believe such doctrines as he himself believes. An orthodox employer believes, that if his work-people were led to renounce such doctrines as the doctrine of the trinity, natural depravity, satisfaction to Justice by the death of Christ, justification and salvation by relying on the merits of Christ, &c.,—I say the orthodox employer believes, that if his work-people were led to renounce those doctrines, and to adopt in their place such doctrines as those which *I* teach, their work-people would not only be shut out of heaven, but tumbled down into hell—plunged over-head in flames and fire, tortured with fire and brimstone, mocked and insulted by devils and lost souls, subjected unceasingly to the most unutterable and excruciating agonies both of soul and body, and forced into weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth for ever and ever. They consider themselves bound therefore, by the most solemn and awful obligations conceivable, to do all they can to prevent any one from sowing the seeds of what they consider error and heresy amongst their work-people. They consider—they *must* consider, if they be consistent—that in allowing a man to work in their factories, to hold intercourse with their work-people, to talk to the young men and young women in their workshops as I should talk if I were one of their work-people, they would be guilty of a crime of the greatest possible magnitude; a crime infinitely worse than murder. They would consider the murder of a few hundreds of human beings as a trifle, compared with the destruction of a single soul; and they would consider the toleration of heretical individuals in their establishments as conniving at the destruction of a *number* of immortal souls.

The truth is, orthodox people cannot help but feel themselves bound to persecute, to some extent, all who disbelieve their peculiar doctrines, and spread abroad such opinions as those which I believe and promulgate. They would consider themselves bound, if they had the opportunity, to prevent such persons as myself, not only from holding intercourse with their *work-people*, but from holding intercourse with their *friends*, their *relations*, their *neighbors*, their *countrymen*, or any others of their fellow-men. The natural tendency of a belief in orthodox doctrines is to make people persecutors: and if the orthodox doctrines were true, it would be the *duty* of those who hold them, either to compel all heretics to be silent, or to put them as quickly and as quietly as possible out of the world. Numbers of orthodox people wonder how God Almighty can allow such men as me to live. Numbers of them pray to God, morning and night, every day of their lives, to take me away from the earth. They exclaim, in the most melancholy tones imaginable, 'It had been better for that man if he had never been born.' If they could do it without injury to their reputation or danger to their own lives, they would put me to death. They would consider they were doing God a very great service, and conferring on mankind an incalculable advantage, in putting me quickly and [illegible] to rest.

I must also remark, that when I myself believed in some of those orthodox doctrines, I considered myself bound to act, to a great extent, as orthodox people now act towards me. I regarded such men as Theodore Parker, and W. J. Fox, as among the most wicked of mankind. I regarded them as foes to God and to the human race. I looked on every one that held such opinions as I now hold, as accursed of God. I considered the fact that they held such opinions, as proof sufficient that they were corrupt in soul, and incorrigibly wicked. I looked on their opinions as a proof that God, on account of their wickedness, had given them up to strong delusions of the devil, to believe a lie, that they might be damned. I considered their belief of such opinions as those which I now hold, a proof that whatever they might be *openly*, before the world, they were, *secretly*, unholy, ungodly, lovers of sin, and haters of righteousness. And I considered it to be my duty to do what I could to prevent such persons from spreading their opinions in the would. If I had had at that time a room, like the large room in the Exchange Buildings, I should have considered it my duty to refuse to allow such persons the use of it. I should have considered, if I had allowed them to lecture on their peculiar opinions in such a room, that I had been guilty of co-operating with God's enemies.

And further. If I had had a man in my employment who held such views as I now hold, I should have considered it my duty, if I had seen reason to fear that he would infect other persons under my charge with his views, to dismiss him. I should have considered it my duty to dismiss him out of regard to the interests of those entrusted to my care. If I had had the management of an insurance office, I should even have hesitated to insure the property of a man who held and inculcated such views as those which I now hold and inculcate. I am not certain that either the committee of the Exchange Rooms, or the directors of the different Insurance Companies, have done anything, in my case, which I myself should not have done under similar circumstances, some twelve or fifteen years ago.

And I am sure I was sincere and conscientious at that time. I was honestly religious, and ardently benevolent. I wished for nothing so much as the spread of the Gospel, and the welfare and happiness of mankind. I was, I believe, as zealous an advocate of what I believed to be truth, and as unwearied a laborer in what I believed to be the cause of God and of humanity, as any man in England. It would therefore be foolish for me to suppose, that the committee for letting the Exchange Rooms, and the directors of the different Insurance Companies, may not be sincere and honest—or may not be desirous of serving the cause of God and of humanity. My own opinion is, that *orthodox views of theology* are to blame for the intolerance of many of those persons. Orthodox opinions render it impossible for a man to be tolerant; while certain other opinions render it perfectly easy for honest and well disposed men to be tolerant. It is impossible to make orthodox people tolerant, without curing them of their orthodoxy. It would be a weakness, an inconsistency, a crime, in orthodox people to be tolerant. Toleration can only become consistent and virtuous in them, when they have ceased to be orthodox.—*The People.*

ART AGAINST APPETITE.

The object of food is, so to support the body in its natural development that it may reach a reasonable age without becoming too robust. Civilization can instruct us so to manage, that a gentle dissolution treads upon the heels of growth, that, as Metastasio hath it—

"——dalle fasee,
Si comincia a morir quando si nasce."*

An infant's appetite is all for milk; but art suggests a few additions to that lamentably simple diet. A lady not long since complacently informed her medical attendant that, for the use of a baby, then about eight months old, she had spent nine pounds in "Infant's Preservative." Of this, or of some like preparation, the advertisements tell us that it compels Nature to be orderly, and that all infants take it with greediness. So we have even justice to the child. Pet drinks Preservative; papa drinks Port.

Then there is "Farinaceous Food." Here, for a purpose, we must interpolate a bit of science. There is a division of food into two great classes, nourishment and fuel. Nourishment is said to exist chiefly in animal flesh and blood, and in vegetable compounds which exactly correspond thereto, called vegetable fibrine, albumen, and caseine. Fuel exists in whatever contains much carbon: fat and starchy vegetables, potatoes, gum, sugar, alcoholic liquors. If a person take more nourishment than he wants, it is said to be wasted; if he take more fuel than he wants, part of it is wasted, and part of it the body stacks away as fat. These men of science furthermore assert that the correct diet of a healthy man must contain eight parts of fuel food to one of nourishment. This preserves equilibrium, they say—suits, therefore, an adult; the child, who has to be come bigger as it lives, has use for an excess of nourishment. And so one of the doctors, Dr. R. D. Thompson, gives this table; it has been often copied. The proportion of nourishment to fuel is in

Milk (food for a growing animal)	1 to 2
Beans	1 " 2 1-2
Oatmeal	1 " 5
Barley	1 " 7
Wheat flour (food for an animal at rest)	1 " 8
Potatoes	1 " 9
Rice	1 " 10
Turnips	1 " 11
Arrow-root, tapioca, sago	1 " 26
Starch	1 " 40

Very well, gentlemen, we take your facts. As ægritudinary men, we know what use to make of them. We will give infants farinaceous food; arrow-root, tapioca, and the like; quite ready to be taught by you that so we give one particle of nourisment in twenty-six. Tell us, This diet is like putting leeches on a child. We are content. Leeches give a delicate whiteness that we are thankful to be able to obtain without the biting or the bloodshed.

Sanitary people will allow a child, up to its seventh year, nothing beyond bread, milk, water, sugar, light meat broth, without fat, and fresh meat for its dinner, when it is old enough to bite it, with a little well-cooked vegetable. They confine a child, poor creature, to this miserable fare; permitting, in due season, only a pittance of the ripest fruit.

They would give children, while they are growing, oatmeal and milk for breakfast, made into a porridge. They would deny them beer. You know how strengthening that is, and yet these people say that there is not an ounce of meal in a whole bucketful. They would deny them comfits, cakes, wine, pastry, and grudge them nuts; but our boys shall rebel against all this. We will teach them to regard cake as bliss, and wine as glory; we will educate them to a love of tarts. Once let our art secure over the stomach its ascendancy, and the civilized organ acquires new desires. Vitiated cravings, let the sanitary doctors call them; let them say that children will eat garbage, as young women will eat chalk and coals, not because it is their nature to do so, but because it is a symptom of disordered function. We know nothing about function. Art against appetite has won the day, and the pale face of civilization is established.

Plain sugar, it is a good thing to forbid our children; there is something healthy in their love of it. Suppose we tell them that it spoils the teeth. They know no better; we do. We know that the negroes, who in a great measure live upon sugar, are quite famous for their sound, white teeth; and Mr. Richardson tells us of tribes among the Arabs of Sahara, whose beautiful teeth he lauds, that they are in the habit of keeping about them a stick of sugar in a leathern case, which they bring out from time to time for a suck, as we bring out the snuff-box for a pinch. But we will tell our children that plain sugar spoils the teeth; sugar mixed with chalk or verdigris, or any other mess—that is to say, civilized sugar, they are welcome to.

And for ourselves, we will eat anything. The more our cooks, with spice, with druggery and pastry, raise our wonder up, the more we will approve their handicraft. We will excite the stomach with a peppered soup; we will make fish indigestible with melted butter, and correct the butter with cayenne. We will take sauce, we will drink wine, we will drink beer, we will eat pie-crust, we will eat indescribable productions—we will take celery and cheese and ale, we will take liquor—we will take wine and olives and more wine, and oranges, and almonds, and anything else that may present itself; and we will call all that our dinner, and for such the stomach shall accept it, We will eat more than we need, but will compel an appetite. Art against Appetite for ever.

Sanitary people bear ill-will to pie-crust; they teach that butter, after being baked therein, becomes a compound hateful to the stomach. We will eat pies, we will eat pastry, we will eat—we would eat M. Soyer himself in a tart, if it were possible.

We will uphold London milk. Mr. Rugg says that it is apt to contain chalk, the brains of sheep, oxen, and cows, flour, starch, treacle, whiting, sugar of lead, arnotto, size, etc. Who cares for Mr. Rugg? London milk is better than country milk, for London cows are town cows. They live in a city, in close sheds, in our own dear alleys—are consumptive—they are delightful cows; only their milk is too strong; it requires watering and doctoring, and then it is delicious milk.

Tea, we are not quite sure about. Some people say that because tea took so sudden a hold upon the human appetite, because it spread so widely in so short a time, that, therefore, it supplies a want: its use is natural. Liebig suggests that it supplies a constituent of bile. I think rather that its use has become general because it causes innocent intoxication. Few men are not glad to be made cheerful harmlessly. For this reason I think it is that the use of tea and coffee has become popular; and since whatever sustains cheerfulness advances health—the body working with good will under a pleasant master—tea does our service little good. In excess, no doubt it can be rendered hurtful (so can bread and butter); but the best way of pressing it into employment, as an ægritudinary acid, is by the practice of taking it extremely hot. A few observations upon the temperature at which food is refused by all the lower animals, will soon convince you that in man—not as regards tea only, but in a great many respects—art has established her own rule, and that the appetite of Nature has been conquered.

We have a great respect for Alcoholic Liquors. It has been seen that the excess of these makes fat; they, therefore, who have least need of fat, according to our rules, are those who have most need of wine and beer.

Of ordinary meats there is not much to say. We have read of Dr. Beaumont's servant, who had an open musket-hole, leading into his stomach, through which the Doctor made experiments. Many experiments were made; and tables drawn, of no great value, on the digestibility of divers kinds of meat. Climate and habit are, on such points, paramount. Pig is polution to the children of the Sun, the Jew and Mussulman; but children of winter, the Scandinavians, could not imagine Paradise complete without it. Schrimner, the sacred hog, cut up daily and eaten by the tenants of Walhalla, collected his fragments in the night; and was in his sty ready for slaughter, the next morning. These things concern us little, for it is not with plain meat that we have here to do, but with the noble Art of Cookery. That art, which once obeyed and now commands our appetite, which is become the teacher where it was the taught, we duly reverence. When ægritudinary science shall obtain its college, and when each Unhealthy Course shall have its eminent professor to teach Theory and Practice, then we shall have a Court of Alderman for Patrons, a Grave digger for Principal, and a Cook shall be Dean of the Faculty.

* ——from swaddling clothes,
Dying begins at birth

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

THE AGE BEFORE NEWSPAPERS.—I am so put to it for something to say, that I would make a memorandum of the most improbable lie that could be invented by a viscountess dowager; as the old Duchess of Rutland does when she is told of some strange casualty, "Lucy, child, step into the next room and set that down"—"Lord, madam!" says Lady Lucy, "it can't be true!" "Oh, no matter, child; it will do for news into the country next post."—*Horace Walpole.*

——PARTIAL JUDGMENTS.—How is it that men should regard idleness as so great a crime in a poor man, and look upon it as innocent or honorable in a rich man? How is it that so many should think it necessary to prevent the poor from obtaining bread without labor, while they allow others to obtain, not only bread, but every possible luxury, without it. If we condemn *one* man because he is idle, let us condemn *all* that are idle. If we try to make it impossible for *one* idle man to live at the expense of his brethren, let us endeavor to make it impossible for *all* idle men to live at the expense of their brethren. If we say to one man, If you will not work, neither shall you eat; let us say the same to all. Every man ought to work in some useful way, and we ought to do what we can to induce all thus to work. Those who are not under the necessity of working for wages, ought to work for the welfare of their country and their kind. Those who are not bound to plough and sow, or to gather wool and make cloth, are bound to labor in some other useful way. No man who has health or strength and intellect, has a good excuse for idleness. If men who are able to serve their generation neglect to do so, we ought in some way to punish them. If we cannot punish them by fines, imprisonment, or transportation, we should punish them by the expression of our disapprobation; by holding them up before the world as criminals, and refusing to hold friendly fellowship with them. We ought not to content ourselves with saying, God will punish them in a future state; we ought to endeavor to bring down punishment upon them in some form in the present life. —*The People.*

——BEAUTY OF JEWESSES.—It is related that Chateaubriand, on returning from his Eastern travels, was asked if he could assign a reason why the women of the Jewish race were so much handsomer than the men, when he gave the following one:—"Jewesses," he said, "have escaped the curse which alighted upon their fathers, husbands, and sons. Not a Jewess was to be seen among the crowd of priests and rabble who insulted the son of God, scourged Him, crowned Him with thorns, and subjected Him to infamy and the agony of the cross. The women of Judea believed in the Savior, and assisted and soothed Him under affliction. A woman of Bethany poured on his head precious ointment, which she kept in a vase of alabaster. The sinner anointed his feet with perfumed oil, and wiped them with her hair. Christ, on his part, extended mercy to the Jewesses. He raised from the dead the son of the widow of Nain, and Martha's brother Lazarus. He cured Simon's mother-in-law, and the woman who touched the hem of his garment. To the Samaritan woman he was a spring of living water, and a compassionate judge to the woman in adultery. The daughters of Jerusalem wept over him; the holy woman accompanied him to Calvary, brought him balm and spices; and weeping, sought him in the sepulchre. 'Woman, why weepest thou?' His first appearance after the resurrection was to Mary Magdalene. He said to her, 'Mary!' At the sound of his voice Mary Magdalene's eyes were opened, and she answered, 'Master.' The reflection of some beautiful ray must have rested on the brow of the Jewesses."

——THE SEVEN-MILE TUNNEL THROUGH THE ALPS.—To give some idea of the boldness of this great undertaking, (says the *London Weekly Times*,) we may, in the first place, state that in its progress the tunnel must pass under some of the most elevated crests of Mont Cenis—one, in particular, where there will be 4850 feet of mountain, capped with eternal glaciers, overhead at the middle of the tunnel, so that not only will the workmen and machinery in construction, and the passengers and trains in transit, be buried to that depth in the heart of the mountain, but all idea of shafts, either to facil